



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

3 Wb EST
S. H. S. 12

Ms. Sman

MF

©

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANCIENT AND MODERN,
IN
FOUR BOOKS,

MUCH CORRECTED, ENLARGED AND IMPROVED,

FROM THE

PRIMARY AUTHORITIES,

BY JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, D. D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN.

**A NEW AND LITERAL TRANSLATION, FROM THE ORIGINAL
LATIN, WITH COPIOUS ADDITIONAL NOTES,
ORIGINAL AND SELECTED.**

BY JAMES MURDOCK, D. D.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

NEW HAVEN:
PUBLISHED BY A. H. MALTBY.

1832.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1832, by JAMES MUR-
DOCK, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Connecticut.

BALDWIN AND TREADWAY, PRINTERS.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

To supply the more intelligent and especially the younger clergy, with a comprehensive history of the christian religion and church, from the earliest times to the present day,—a history which shall touch all the more important facts, briefly and distinctly, yet candidly, and with constant references to authorities and to sources of additional information, and thus be a complete guide to those who wish to go deeply into this science, and afford of itself a good general knowledge of the whole subject;—such was the design of Dr. *Mosheim* in the following work, and such has been the aim of the present translator.

The great need of such a work at the present day, when every other branch of theology is much cultivated, is so generally felt, that it is unnecessary to say any thing to evince its importance, or to excite an interest on the subject. The only things therefore, which here claim attention, are, the character and history of Dr. *Mosheim* and his work, the reasons for giving it in a new translation, and the additions made to it by way of notes.

John Lawrence von Mosheim was nobly born at Lubec, October 9, 1694. His education was completed at the university of Keil; where he became professor of philosophy at an early age. In youth he cultivated a taste for poetry; and he actually published criticisms on that subject. But pulpit eloquence, biblical and historical theology, and practical religion were his favorite pursuits. He published seven volumes of sermons, and left a valuable treatise on preaching, which was printed after his death. The English and French preachers, particularly Tillotson and Watts, Saurin, Massillon and Flechier, were his models. The Germans admit, that he contributed much to improve the style and manner of preaching in their country. While a professor at Kiel, his reputation rose so high, that the king of Denmark invited him to a professorship at Copenhagen. But the duke of Brunswick, soon after, in the year 1725, called him to the divinity chair at Helmstadt; which he filled with great applause for twenty-two years. In 1747, when George II, king of England, the founder of the university of Gottingen, wished to place over it men of the highest rank in the literary world, Dr. *Mosheim* was

deemed worthy to be its chancellor, and the head of the department of theology. In this honorable station he remained eight years, or till his death, September 9, 1755. His works were very numerous; consisting of Latin translations and editions of learned works in English, French, Dutch, and Greek, with valuable notes; an immense number of disquisitions relating to historical, dogmatic, and moral subjects; besides orations, sermons, letters, &c. On church history, in which he most distinguished himself, he published two volumes of essays on detached subjects: and among other works, a compendious church history, in two volumes, 12mo. a full church history of the first century, 4to. Commentary on the affairs of christians, till the times of Constantine, 4to. and he had just published the revision and enlargement of his compendious church history, under the new title of *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, ancient and modern*, in one vol. 4to. when he was removed by death, at the age of 61.

The character of Dr. Mosheim, is thus given, by his disciple and translator, *J. R. Schlegel*. "We may have had, perhaps, biblical interpreters, who, like Ernesti and Michaelis, expounded the scriptures with more philosophical and critical learning: perhaps also, theologians and moralists, who have treated dogmatic and practical theology, with more metaphysical precision:—we may likewise, have had, and perhaps still have, pulpit orators, who, among the many unsuccessful imitators of Mosheim's method, have even rivaled him, and come near to that ideal perfection which he wished to see realized. But in ecclesiastical history, the merits of Mosheim are so decisive and peculiar, that I will not venture to compare him with any of his predecessors, or his successors, in this department of learning. He is, as Schroeckh says, our first *real historian*, in church history."* Dr. *Maclaine* informs us, that after he had commenced his translation, he received a letter from bishop *Warburton*, saying: "*Mosheim's compendium is excellent, the method admirable; in short, the only one deserving the name of an ecclesiastical history. It deserves, and needs, frequent notes.*"

Mosheim's *Institutes*, as well as most of his other historical works, being written in Latin, were accessible to learned foreigners. And Dr. *Archibald Maclaine*, the son of a dissenting minister in the north of Ireland, and himself an assistant minister to an English congregation at the Hague, published an English translation of these *Institutes*, so early as the year 1764; only nine years after the appearance of the original. Dutch and French translations were also made; but I know not by whom, or at what time. In 1769, *J. A. C. von Einem*, a pious but not profound

* Schlegel's Mosheim, vol. i. Preface.

German minister, commenced his German translation of the *Institutes*. His design was, to bring down the work to the capacities of the unlearned, and to render it an edifying book for common christians. Accordingly, he omitted nearly all the marginal references and discussions, and introduced much religious biography and historical detail. His translation fills six vols. 8vo. and the continuation of the history three additional volumes. In the year 1770, *John R. Schlegel*, rector of the gymnasium of Heilbronn, a learned and judicious man, commenced another German translation; which is very literal and close, and free from all interpolations, but accompanied with learned notes. This translation, in four large volumes 8vo. was completed in 1780: and a continuation of the history in two volumes, appeared in 1784, and 1788.

The lectures and the printed works of Mosheim on ecclesiastical history, kindled up such ardor for this science in Germany, that in the course of fifty years, *Baumgarten*, *Semler*, *Schroeckh*, *Henke*, and *Schmidt*, severally, produced large and valuable church histories. Of these, the most full and complete is that of *Schroeckh*, a pupil of Mosheim, continued by *Tzschirner*, in forty-five vol. 8vo: and next, that of *Henke*, continued by *Vater*, in nine vol. 8vo. Nor has the ardor for this branch of theology yet subsided in Germany: for professor *Neander*, of Berlin, is now publishing a profound and philosophical church history, which, if completed on the plan commenced, will probably fill twenty-five or thirty volumes 8vo. The limits assigned to this preface will not allow a discussion of the merits of these several successors of Mosheim. Suffice it to say, that a careful examination of them all, has resulted in the decided conviction, that Mosheim's history, in a form similar to that given to it by Schlegel, is the best adapted to the wants of this country, and the most likely to meet general approbation among the American clergy.

The necessity for a new English version of the *Institutes*, arises principally from the unauthorized liberties taken by the former translator, under the mistaken idea of improving the work, and rendering it more acceptable to the public. He says in his preface: "*The style of the original is by no means a model to imitate, in a work designed for general use. Dr. Mosheim affected brevity, and labored to crowd many things into few words: thus his diction, though pure and correct, became sententious and harsh, without that harmony which pleases the ear, and those transitions which make a narration flow with ease. This being the case, I have sometimes taken considerable liberties with my author, and followed the spirit of his narrative without adhering strictly to the letter:—and have often added a*

few sentences, to render an observation more striking, a fact more clear, a portrait more finished." Thus Dr. Maclaine frankly owns, that he designed to render the work interesting to those superficial readers, who delight in that harmony which pleases the ear, and in those transitions which make a narration flow with ease; and that he *often* added a few sentences of his own, to give more vivacity and point to the sentiments of his author, or more splendor to their dress. And whoever will be at the pains of comparing his translation with the original, may see, that he has essentially changed the *style*, and greatly colored and altered in many places the *sentiments* of his author; in short, that he has *paraphrased*, rather than *translated*, a large part of the work. The book is thus rendered heavy and tedious to the reader, by its superfluity of words; and likewise obscure and indefinite, and sometimes self-contradictory, by the looseness of its unguarded statements. Its credibility also as a history of facts, is impaired, and it fails of carrying full conviction to the mind; because it is stripped of its native simplicity, precision, and candor. For no wise man will confide in a writer, who appears intent on fabricating sonorous and flowing periods, who multiplies splendid epithets, and habitually deals in loose and unqualified assertions. Nor is this all, for the old translation has actually exposed Dr. Mosheim to severe and unmerited censure, from different quarters: and Dr. *Maclaine* has long stood accused before the public, as a translator, "who has interwoven his own sentiments in such a manner with those of the original author, both in the notes and in the text, that it is impossible for a mere English reader to distinguish them; and in diverse instances, he has entirely contradicted him. This (add the accusers) will be evident to all, if a literal translation of Mosheim shall ever be published."* It is not strange therefore, that so large a portion of the community have been dissatisfied with Dr. Maclaine's Mosheim, and have desired a more faithful and literal version of this valuable author.

If the translation here offered to the public, is what it was intended to be, it is a close, literal version, containing neither more nor less than the original, and presenting the exact thoughts of the author in the same direct, artless, and lucid manner, with as much similarity in the phraseology and modes of expression, as the idioms of the two languages would admit. That all the elegancies of the Latin style and diction of the author have been retained, is not pretended. The translator can only say, he has aimed to give Mosheim, as far as he was able, the same port and mien in English, as he has in Latin.

But writing out an entirely new and independent translation of

* See the New York edition of Maclaine's Mosheim, in 1824. vol. iv. p. 284.

the Institutes, has not been half the labor bestowed on the work. Every where, the statements of Mosheim have been compared with the sources from which they were drawn, and with the representations of other standard writers of different communities, so far as the means of doing this were at hand. The reasonings also of Mosheim have been weighed with care. And nothing has been suffered to go before the public, without first passing an examination, by the best criteria within the reach of the translator. Often, days and weeks have been consumed in such examinations, when the results were, that Mosheim's statements needed no correction, or at least that no palpable errors were discovered, in them ; and it was therefore deemed advisable to allow him to express his own views, without note or comment. But in many instances, the translator supposed that he discovered mistakes or defects in his author, which called for animadversion. In these cases, he has given in the form of notes such statements and criticisms, as he deemed necessary. Numerous other instances occurred, in which Mosheim was found to differ from other standard writers, or to have simply omitted what the translator or others deemed worth inserting ; and in such cases the opinions or statements of other writers have been given, that the reader might be able to compare them, and the omitted matter has been supplied. In the history of the *primitive church*, for two or three centuries, the translator deemed almost every thing interesting, which can be learned with any degree of certainty. Accordingly, his notes and animadversions here, are more frequent and minute, than in the subsequent parts of the work.—In regard to what are called the *fathers*, especially those of the four first centuries, and likewise the *leading men* in the church in all ages, he has deemed it proper greatly to enlarge the account given by Mosheim ; not so much by minutely tracing the history of their private lives, as by more fully stating their *public* characters and acts, and mentioning such of their works as have come down to us. In no one respect, has the history been more enlarged, than in this. Through all the ages down to the reformation, the eminent men, whom Mosheim thought proper to name particularly, have each a distinct note assigned them, containing all of much importance which can be said of them : and in each century, at the close of Mosheim's list of eminent men, nearly a complete catalogue of all those omitted by him, is subjoined, with brief notices of the most material things known concerning them.—On the controversies and disputes among christians, especially such as related to religious *doctrines*, much and critical attention has been bestowed. So also the reputed *heresies*, and the different *sects* of professed christians, which Mosheim had treated with great fulness and ability,

have been carefully re-examined, and subjected to critical remarks. Here great use has been made of the writers who succeeded Mosheim ; and particularly, the younger *Walch*.—The propagation of christianity, especially among the nations of Europe, in the middle ages, and among the Asiatics by the Nestorians, has been the subject of frequent, and sometimes long notes.—The origin and history of the *reformation*, particularly in countries not of the Augsburg confession ; also the contests between the Lutherans and the Reformed, and the history of the English and Scotch churches, and of the English dissenters ; have received particular attention : and the occasional mistakes of Mosheim, have been carefully pointed out. Yet the enlargements of the history since the times of Luther, and particularly during the 17th century, have been the less considerable, because there was danger of swelling the third volume to a disproportionate size, and because another opportunity is anticipated for supplying these omissions.

These remarks may give some idea of the extensive additions to the original by way of notes. All additions to the work are carefully distinguished from the original, by being inclosed in brackets. They are also accompanied with a notice of the persons, responsible for their truth and correctness. What the translator gives as his own, he subscribes with a *Tr*. When he borrows from others, which he has done very largely, he either explicitly states what is borrowed, and from whom, or subjoins the name of the author. Thus several notes are borrowed directly from *Maclaine* : and these are not only marked as quotations, but they have the signature *Macl*, annexed. A few others are translated from *von Einem's* Mosheim ; and these have the signature *von Ein*. affixed. But the learned and judicious *Schlegel* has been taxed for the greatest amount of contributions. Throughout the work, his notes occur, translated from the German, and with the signature *Schl*. annexed.

The work is now divided—perhaps for the first time—into *three* volumes, of nearly equal size, each embracing a grand and distinct period of church history, strongly marked with its own peculiar characteristics ; and being furnished with a separate index, each volume is a complete and independent work of itself.

A continuation of the history to the present time, is deemed so important, that the translator intends, if his life and health are spared, to attempt a compilation of this sort, as soon as the printing of these volumes shall be completed.

NEW HAVEN, February 22, 1832.

THE.
AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

My *Institutes of Christian History* (1) having been long out of print, the worthy person at whose expense they were published, has often requested me to give a new edition of them, somewhat improved and enlarged. This request, I for many years resisted; for I was reluctant to suspend other works, then on my hands, which I deemed more important; besides, I must acknowledge that I shrunk from the task of correcting and enlarging a book, which needed so much amendment. The importunities of the publisher, however, and of other friends who joined with him, at length overcame my tardiness: and now, after the leisure hours of two years have been spent on the work, it is brought to a close; and these *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* now make their appearance, not only in a new form and dress, but so materially changed, as to be almost entirely a new work.

The distribution of the materials under certain heads, which I had before deemed the best form for the learner, is still retained; for notwithstanding weighty reasons have occurred to my mind for preferring a continuous and unbroken narration, I have chosen to follow the judgment of those excellent men, whom experience has led to prefer the former method. And indeed, a little reflection must convince us, that whoever would embrace in a single book all the facts and observations necessary to a full acquaintance with the state of the church in every age of it, must of course adopt some classification and distribution of those facts; and as such was the design of the following work, I have left its primitive form unchanged, and have directed my attention solely to the correction, improvement, and enlargement of the work, so as to render it a more useful book.

My principal care has been, to impart fidelity and authority to the narration. For this purpose, I have gone to the primary

(1) [A work in 2 vols. 12mo. first published in 1737—41; and afterwards abridged by *J. P. Miller*, in 1 vol. 12mo. Hamb. 1752. Tr.]

sources of information, such as the best writers of all ages, who lived in or near the times they describe; and have consulted them with attention; and have transcribed from them, whenever they were sufficiently concise, and at the same time clear and nervous. It is often the case, that those who write summaries of history, only abridge the more voluminous historians: and this method, I myself before pursued, to a considerable degree. But such a procedure, though sometimes justifiable, and not to be wholly condemned, is attended with this evil, that it perpetuates the mistakes, which are apt to abound in very large and voluminous works; by causing them to pass from a single book into numerous others. I had long been apprised of this danger; but I felt it, with no little mortification, when I brought the light of testimony from the best authorities, to shine on the pages of my own work. I now perceived, that writers preeminent for their diligence and fidelity, are not always to be trusted; and found that, I had abundant occasion for adding, expunging, changing, and correcting, in every part of my book. In performing this task, I know that I have not been wanting in patience and industry, or in watchfulness and care; but whether these have secured me against all mistakes, which is confessedly of no easy accomplishment, I leave *them* to judge who are best informed in ecclesiastical affairs. To aid persons disposed to institute such inquiries, I have, in general, made distinct reference to my authorities; and if I have perverted their testimony, either by misstatement or misapplication, I confess myself to be less excusable than other transgressors in this way, because I had before me all the authors whom I quote, and I turned them over, and read and compared them with each other, being resolved to follow solely their guidance.

This desire, to render my history as authentic and correct as the best authorities would permit and require, has caused many and various changes and additions, throughout the work: but in no part of it are the alterations greater, or more noticeable, than in the *Third Book*, which contains the history of the church, and especially the Latin or western church, from the time of Charlemagne to the reformation by Luther. This period of ecclesiastical history, though it embraces great events, and is very important on account of the light it casts on the origin and causes of the present civil and religious state of Europe, thereby enabling us correctly to estimate and judge of many things that occur in our own times, has not hitherto been treated with the same neatness, perspicuity, and solidity, as the other parts of church history. Here the number of original writers, is great: yet few of them are in common use, or are of easy acquisition: they all frighten us, either with their bulk, the barbarity of their style, or their excessive

price: not a few of them, either knowingly, or ignorantly, corrupt the truth; or at least, obscure it by their ignorance and unskilfulness: and some of them have not yet been published. It is not strange therefore, that many things in this part of ecclesiastical history should be either passed over in silence, or be less happily stated and explained, even by the most laborious and learned authors. Among these, the ecclesiastical annalists, and the historians of the monastic sects, so famous in the Roman church, as *Baronius*, *Raynald*, *Bzovius*, *Manriquez*, *Wadding*, and others, though richly supplied with ancient manuscripts and records, have often committed more faults, and fallen into greater mistakes, than writers far inferior to them in learning, reputation, and means of information. Having therefore bestowed much attention, during many years, on the history of the church from the eighth century onwards, and believing that I had obtained, from works published or still in manuscript, a better and more correct knowledge of many events, than is given in the common accounts of those times; I conceived, that I might do service to the cause of ecclesiastical history, by exhibiting to the world some of the results of my investigations; and that, by throwing some light on the obscure period of the middle ages, I might excite men of talents and industry to pursue the same object, and thus to perfect the history of the Latin church. I persuade myself, that I have brought forward some things which are new, or before little known; that other things, which had been stated incorrectly or obscurely, I have here exhibited with clearness, and traced back to the proper authorities; and—claiming the indulgence allowed an old man, to boast a little—that some things, which were accredited fables, I have now exploded. Whether I deceive myself, in all this, or not, the discerning reader may ascertain, by examining, and comparing with the common accounts, what I have here said respecting Constantine's donation, the Cathari and Albigenses, the Beghards and Beguines, the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, (that pest to many parts of Europe during four centuries,) and of the Fratricelli [or Little Brethren,] the controversies between the Franciscans and the Roman pontiffs, the history of Berengarius and of the Lollards, and several other subjects.

If, in these enlargements of ecclesiastical history, and while giving views either partially or wholly new, I had used the same brevity, as on the subjects well stated and explained by many before me, I should neither have satisfied the inquisitive reader, nor have done justice to myself. For many would have regarded me, as a writer of fables; and *their* conceptions on these subjects, would have been indistinct, useless, and fallacious. Therefore, when I have departed widely from the common statements, or advanced

apparent novelties, I have not only aimed to be very explicit, but in order to give credibility to my narration, have gone into more ample disquisitions, and citations of authorities; because full statements and demonstrations, though out of place in an epitome of history, were here indispensable.

In addition to these causes for changing materially the character and swelling the size of my book, another occurred, soon after I commenced its revision. I had before designed my work, especially, for *lecturers* on church history; who need a compendious text for the basis of their instructions; and had therefore only touched upon many things, which I supposed would be dilated and explained more fully by the lecturer. But when I began to revise and correct the work for a new edition, it occurred to me, that it would be more satisfactory to many, and better subserve the cause of sacred learning, if the book were adapted, not merely to the convenience of lecturers, but also to the wants of those, who attempt, without a teacher, to gain a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history. As soon as this thought occurred, my views were changed; and I began at once to supply omissions, to explain more at large what was obscure, and to give precision and distinctness to the whole narration. And hence it is, that in describing the calamities in which the christians of the first ages were involved, more pains are taken, than is commonly done, to state precisely the truth; and in tracing the origin and progress of the sects which disturbed the church, great accuracy is attempted; so, likewise, the innovations in religion, devised by those who love new things, are calmly and candidly described, with all possible fidelity; and religious contests and disputes are more clearly stated, and the arguments more carefully weighed, than before; and the history of the Roman pontiffs after the times of Charlemagne, their wars, and their various enterprises, have received more careful attention. I mention these only as specimens of what has been attempted, for the advantage of those, who cannot pursue a regular course of church history, from their want of books or leisure, and yet wish to obtain clear and correct views of the principal facts and transactions. The book may be safely trusted, for the most part, by such readers; and it will afford them as much knowledge, as will satisfy one that reads only for practical purposes; and besides, will direct to the authors, from whom more full information may be obtained.

It would be folly, and betray ignorance of human imperfection, if I should suppose that, no errors *could* be detected; and that nothing needed correction, in all the details of so large a history: yet conscious of my own integrity and good faith, and of the pains I

have taken to avoid mistakes, I cannot but hope, that I have rarely so failed, that serious evils will result from my errors.

I could add some other prefatory remarks, which would perhaps not be useless; but nothing more need be added, to enable those to judge correctly of the present work, who will be candid and ingenuous, and who are competent judges in such matters. I therefore conclude, by offering the just tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who has given me strength, amidst the infirmities of age, and the pressure of other labors and cares, to surmount the difficulties, and bear the fatigue, of completing the work now given to the public.

Gottingen, March 23, 1755.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Ecclesiastical History defined.—§ 2. Its divisions.—§ 3. The external history of the church.—§ 4. Which treats of the prosperous.—§ 5. and the adverse events.—§ 6. The internal history.—§ 7. Which treats of (I) Ministers.—§ 8, 9. (II) Doctrines.—§ 10. (III) Worship.—§ 11. (IV.) Heresies.—§ 12. Events must be traced to their causes.—§ 13. Means of discovering these causes, general—§ 14. and particular; in the external—§ 15. and internal history.—§ 16. The sources of ecclesiastical history. § 17. Qualities of the historian.—§ 18. He must be free from all prejudices.—§ 19. Faults of historians.—§ 20. Uses of ecclesiastical history, general—§ 21. and special.—§ 22, 23. Method in ecclesiastical history; division into periods—§ 24. Distribution under heads.

§ 1. *The Ecclesiastical History of the New Dispensation* is a clear and faithful narrative of the external condition and of the internal state and transactions of that body of men, who have borne the name of *christians*; and in which, events are so traced to their causes, that the providence of God may be seen in the establishment and preservation of the church, and the reader's piety, no less than his intelligence, be advanced by the perusal.

§ 2. The best form of such a history, seems to be that, which considers the whole body of christians, as constituting a *society* or community, subjected to lawful authority, and governed by certain laws and institutions. To such a community, many external events must happen, which will be favorable to its interests, or adverse to them: and, since nothing human is stable and uniform, many things will occur, in the bosom of such community, tending to change its character. Hence its history may, very suitably, be divided into its *external* and its *internal* history. In this manner, the history of the christian community, in order to its embracing all the details, and promoting the greatest usefulness, should be divided.

§ 3. The *external* history of christians, or of the christian community, is properly called the *history of the church*: and embraces all the occurrences and changes, which have visibly befallen this sacred society. And as all communities are sometimes prosperous, and sometimes meet with adversity, such also has been the lot of christians. Hence, this part of ecclesiastical history is fitly divided into an account of the *prosperous*, and of the *calamitous*, events which christians have experienced.

§ 4. The *prosperous* events, or those tending to the advancement and progress of the christian interest, proceeded either from the heads and leaders, or from the subordinate members, of this community. Its heads and leaders were, either *public* characters, such as kings, magistrates, and sovereign pontiffs; or *private* individuals, the doctors, the learned and influential men. Both classes have contributed much, in all ages, to the increase of the church. Men in power, by their authority, laws, beneficence, and even by their arms, have contributed to establish and enlarge the church. And the doctors and men of learning, of genius, and eminent piety, by their vigorous and noble efforts, their travels, their writings, and their munificence, have successfully recommended the religion of Christ, to those ignorant of it. And common christians, by their faith, their constancy, their piety, their love to God and men, have induced many to become christians.

§ 5. The *calamitous* events, which have befallen the church, arose either from the fault of christians, or from the malice and stratagems of their adversaries. There is abundant evidence, that christians themselves, and especially those who presided in the church, have brought much evil upon the body, by their negligence, their unholy lives, and their strifes and contentions. The *enemies* of Christ's kingdom were also, either *public*, or *private* men. *Public* enemies, namely kings and magistrates, by their laws and penalties, obstructed the progress of christianity. *Private* men, the philosophers, the idol-worshippers, and the despisers of all religion, assailed the church with false accusations, stratagems, and hostile writings.

§ 6. The *internal history* of the christian church, treats of the changes, to which the church in every age has been exposed, in regard to its distinguishing characteristics as a religious society. It may, not unsuitably, be called the *history of the christian religion*. The causes of these internal changes are found, for the most part, in the rulers of the church. These often explained the principles and precepts of christianity, to suit their own fancy or convenience. And as some acquiesced and were submissive, and others not unfrequently resisted, insurrections and internal wars were the consequence. To all these subjects, the intelligent ecclesiastical historian must direct his attention.

§ 7. The first subject, in the internal history of the church, is the *history of its rulers*, and of its government. Originally the teachers and the people, conjointly, administered the affairs of the church. But these teachers, in process of time, assumed a loftier spirit, and trampling on the rights of the people, they claimed sovereign power, both in sacred and secular affairs. At last, things gradually, came to this, that one person held supreme power

over the whole church; or at least, affected to hold it.—Among these governors and guides of the church, some obtained by their writings preeminent fame and influence; and as these were by after ages regarded as oracles, and blindly followed, they ought to rank among the *governors* of the church, whether they held offices in it or not.

§ 8. The *history of the laws* by which this religious society was governed, naturally follows the history of its ministers. The laws peculiar to the christian community, are of two kinds. Some are *divine*, proceeding from God himself: these are written, in those books which christians, very properly, believe to be divinely inspired. Others are *human*; or are enactments of the rulers of the community. The former are usually called *doctrines*; and are divided into two species, namely, *doctrines of faith*, which are addressed to the understanding; and *moral doctrines*, which address the heart or will.

§ 9. In the history of these laws or *doctrines*, it should be our first enquiry, in what estimation has the sacred volume been held from age to age, and how was it interpreted? For in every period, the state of religion among christians has depended on the reverence paid to the sacred volume, and on the manner of expounding it. We should next inquire, how these divine instructions and laws were treated; in what manner they were inculcated and explained, defended against gainsayers, or debased and corrupted. The last inquiry is, how far christians were obedient to these divine laws, or how they lived; and, what measures were taken by the rulers of the church, to restrain the licentiousness of transgressors.

§ 10. The *human laws* of which we speak, are prescriptions relating to the external worship of God, or religious rites, whether derived from custom, or from positive enactment. Rites either *directly* appertain to religion, or *indirectly* refer to it. The former embrace the whole exterior of religious *worship*, both public and private. The latter, include every thing, except direct worship, that is accounted religious and proper. This part of religious history is very extensive; partly from the variety, and partly from the frequent changes, in ceremonies. A concise history can, therefore, only touch upon it, without descending into details.

§ 11. As in civil republics, wars and insurrections sometimes break out; so in the christian republic serious commotions have often arisen, on account of both doctrines and rites. The leaders and authors of these seditions, are called *heretics*; and the opinions for which they separated from other christians, are called *heresies*. The history of these commotions or heresies, should be full and precise. This labor, if wisely expended, and with

impartiality, will well repay the toil : but it is arduous and difficult. For the leaders of these parties have been treated with much injustice ; and their doctrines are misrepresented : nor is it easy to come at the truth, in the midst of so much darkness ; since most of the writings of those called *heretics*, are now lost. Those therefore who approach this part of church history, should exclude every thing invidious from the name heretic : and should consider it as used in its more general sense, to denote those who were the occasion, whether by their own or others' fault, of divisions and contests among christians.

§ 12. In treating of both the external and the internal history of the church, the writer who would be useful, must trace events to their *causes* ; that is, he must tell us, not only *what* happened, but likewise *how* and *why*. He who narrates the naked facts, only enriches our memory and amuses us ; but he who at the same time, states the operative causes of events, profits us ; for he both strengthens our judgment, and increases our wisdom. Yet it must be confessed, that caution is here necessary, lest we fabricate causes, and palm our own waking dreams upon men long since dead.

§ 13. In exploring the causes of events, besides access to ancient *testimony* and the *history of the times*, a good *knowledge of human nature* is requisite. The historian who understands the human character, the propensities and powers, the passions and weaknesses of man, will readily discover the causes of many things attempted or done in former times. No less important is it, to be acquainted with the *education* and the *opinions* of the persons we treat of ; for men commonly regard as praiseworthy and correct, whatever accords with the views and practices of their ancestors and their own sect.

§ 14. To explore causes, in the *external* history, a historian should consider the *civil state* of the countries in which the christian religion was either approved or rejected ; and also their *religious state*, that is, the opinions of the people concerning the Deity and divine worship. For, it will not be difficult to determine, why the church was now prosperous, and now in trouble, if we know what was the form of government, what the character of the rulers, and what the prevailing religion at the time.

§ 15. To dispel obscurities in the *internal* history, nothing is more conducive, than a knowledge of the *history of learning*, and especially of *philosophy*. For, most unfortunately, human learning or philosophy, has, in every age, been allowed more influence in regard to revealed religion, than was proper, considering the nature of the two things. Also a good knowledge of the civil government, and of the ancient superstitions of different countries, is useful to the same end. For, through the prudence, or rather,

the indiscretion of the presiding authorities, many parts of the discipline and worship of the church, have been shaped after the pattern of the ancient religions; and no little deference has been paid to the pleasure of sovereigns, and to human laws, in regulating the church of God.

§ 16. From what *sources*, all this knowledge must be drawn, is quite obvious; namely, from the writers of every age, who have treated of christian affairs; and especially from those contemporary with the events; for testimony or authority is the basis of all true history. Yet we ought not to disregard those who, from the original writers, have compiled histories and annals. For, to refuse proffered assistance, and despise the labors of those who have attempted before us, to throw light on obscure subjects, is mere folly.(1)

§ 17. From all this, it will be easy to determine the essential qualifications of a good ecclesiastical historian. He must have no moderate acquaintance with human affairs in general; his learning must be extensive, his mind sagacious and accustomed to reason, his memory faithful, and his judgment sound and matured by long exercise. In his disposition and temperament, he must be patient of labor, persevering, inflexible in his love of truth and justice, and free from every prejudice.

§ 18. Persons who attempt this species of writing, are liable to prejudice, especially from three sources; namely, *times*, *persons*, and *opinions*. First, the *times* in which we live, often have such ascendancy over us, that, we judge of past ages by our own; we conclude, that, because a particular thing neither does nor can take place in our age, therefore it neither did nor could take place in former times. Secondly, the *persons* with whose testimony we are concerned, especially if for ages they have been highly revered for their holiness or their virtues, acquire such an authority with us, as dazzles and deceives us. And thirdly, our partialities for those *opinions* and doctrines, which we ourselves embrace, often so fetter our minds, that, we unconsciously pervert the truth, in regard to facts. Now, from this triple bondage, the mind must, as far as possible, be set free.

(1) To acquaint us with *all the writers* on ecclesiastical history, was the professed object of *Sev. Walth. Slüterus* in his *Propylæum Historiæ Christianæ*, Lüneb. 1696, 4to. and of *Casp. Sagittarius*, *Introductio ad Historiam Eccles. singulasque ejus partes*; especially vol. 1st. [2 vol. 4to. Jena, 1694, 1718. A good account of the most *important* writers, is given by *G. J. Planck*, *Introduction to theological science*, (in German,) vol. 2d.—By *J. A. Nösselt* and *C. F. L. Simon*, *Guide to a knowledge of the best works in every branch of theology*, (in German,) 2 vol. 8vo. 2d ed. Leipz. 1800–13. Valuable notices of the principal writers, are to be found in *J. G. Walch*, *Bibliotheca theol. selecta*, tomo 3tio. and in his *Historia Eccles. Novi Test.* Also in the (German) Church History of *J. M. Schröckh*, vol. 1st. *Introductio*. Pt. III. *Tr.*]

§ 19. But from this rule, and from others equally obvious and important, how widely ecclesiastical historians have departed, in all ages, is too well known. For, not to mention the many, who think themselves great historians, if they have a good memory; and to pass by those, also, who are governed more by their private interests, than by the love of truth; there are very few writers, whom, neither the sect to which they belong, nor the venerated names of some ancient authors, nor the influence of the age in which they live, can disarm, and divert from the truth. In the present age, more especially, the spirit of the times and the prejudice of opinions have incredible influence. Hence the following arguments, so often occurring in the writings of learned men: *These are true sentiments; therefore we must suppose the ancient christians embraced them. This is correct practice, according to Christ's precepts; therefore, doubtless, the earlier christians so lived. This does not now take place; therefore it did not, in ancient times.*

§ 20. Ecclesiastical history, if written by persons free from these and other faults, cannot fail to be greatly beneficial to mankind at large, but especially to the teachers and guides of the church. Whoever shall consider attentively the numerous, the varied, and threatening dangers, which the christian religion has happily surmounted, will doubtless find himself more established in the belief of this religion, and better prepared to withstand the assaults, the cavils, and insidious attacks, of the irreligious and profane. The many illustrious examples of virtue, with which this history abounds, are admirably suited to awaken pious emotions, and to instil the love of God into lukewarm minds. Those wonderful revolutions and changes, which have occurred in every age of the church, originating often from small beginnings, proclaim aloud the providence of God, and the instability and vanity of all human things. Nor is it of small advantage, to know the origin of the numerous and absurd opinions, superstitions, and errors, which still prevail in many parts of the christian world. For such knowledge will enable us to discover the truth, more clearly, to prize it more, and to defend it better. Of the entertainment, afforded by this and other parts of church history, I shall say nothing.

§ 21. But especially, public instructors, and the ministers of religion, may from this study derive great assistance, in acquiring that practical wisdom, which they so much need. Here, the numerous mistakes of even great men, warn them what to shun, if they would not embroil the christian church; there, many illustrious examples of noble and successful effort, are patterns for their imitation. And for combatting errors, both those inveterate by age,

and those of more recent growth, nothing, except the holy scriptures and sound reason, can be compared with this kind of history. I pass over other advantages, which will be found by experience to result from this study; nor will I mention its subserviency to other branches of knowledge, particularly that of jurisprudence.

§ 22. The two parts of church history, the external and the internal, require a method or arrangement of the work, suited to both. The *external* history, being a long and continued narrative, extending through many centuries, requires a distribution into certain intervals of time, for the benefit of the understanding and memory of the reader, and the preservation of order. Various divisions of time may be adopted. I have preferred the customary one, into centuries, because it is the most approved of; though it is not free from objections.

§ 23. No small part of these objections however, will be removed, if we superadd a more general division of time, or one into longer periods, bounded by certain great revolutions and changes in the state of the church. Accordingly, the whole of the following history is divided into four books. The *first* contains the history of the church of Christ, from its commencement, to the time of Constantine the Great. The *second* extends it from Constantine, to Charlemagne. The *third* continues it, to the time when Luther began the reformation in Germany. The *fourth* and last, brings it down to our own times; [or rather, to the year 1700; with a sketch, merely, of the first part of the 18th century. *Tr.*]

§ 24. Moreover ecclesiastical history treats, as we have already seen, of various distinct, but kindred *subjects*; which may properly be arranged under separate heads. Historians have adopted different classifications; such as their fancies, or their designs in writing, pointed out. The distribution, which we prefer, has been already indicated, [in § 4—11, of this Introduction,] and need not here be repeated.

•

INSTITUTES

OF

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

UNDER THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

CONTAINING

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

FROM

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,

TO

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

CENTURY FIRST.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE WORLD AT THE BIRTH OF OUR SAVIOR.

§ 1. State of the Roman empire.—§ 2. Its evils.—§ 3. Its advantages.—§ 4. Then in Peace.—§ 5. Other nations.—§ 6. All were idolaters.—§ 7. They worshipped different Gods.—§ 8. They were tolerant.—§ 9. Most of their Gods were deceased heroes.—§ 10. Pagan worship.—§ 11. It was confined to times and places.—§ 12 The mysteries.—§ 13. Paganism not the parent of virtue.—§ 14. Its votaries sunk in vice.—§ 15. How supported by the priests.—§ 16. The Roman and Grecian religions.—§ 17. The mixed religions of the provinces.—§ 18. Religions beyond the Roman empire classed.—§ 19. Philosophers unable to reform the world.—§ 20. The oriental and the Grecian Philosophy.—§ 21. Some philosophers subverted all religion.—§ 22. Others debased it; e. g. Aristotelians.—§ 23. Stoics.—§ 24. Platonics.—§ 25. The Eclectics.—§ 26. Use of this chapter.

§ 1. At the time when God became incarnate, a great part of the world was subject to the Romans. Their remoter provinces, they either ruled, by means of temporary governors and presidents sent from Rome, or suffered to live under their own kings and laws, subject to the sovereign control of the Roman republic. The Senate and citizens of Rome, though not deprived of all appearance of liberty, were really under the authority of one man, *Augustus*; who was clothed with the titles of Emperor, Pontifex Maximus, Censor, Tribune of the people, Pro-Consul; in a word, with every office which conferred general power and preeminence in the commonwealth. (1)

(1) See *Aug. Campianus* de Officio et potestate magistratuum Romanorum. et jurisdictione, Lib. I. cap. 1. § 2, p. 3 &c. Geneva, 1725, 4to. [Memoirs of the court of Augustus, by *Tho. Blackwell*, vol. I. II. 4to. Edinb. 1753. Schl.]
VOL. I.

§ 2. The Roman government, if we regard only its form and laws, was sufficiently mild and equitable. (2) But the injustice and avarice of the nobles and provincial governors, the Roman lust of conquest and dominion, and the rapacity of the publicans who farmed the revenues of the state, (3) brought incalculable evils on the people. The magistrates and publicans, on the one hand, fleeced the people of their property; and on the other, this lust of dominion required numerous armies to be raised in the provinces, which was oppressive to them, and was the occasion of almost perpetual wars and insurrections.

§ 3. Still, this widely extended dominion of one people, or rather of one man, was attended with several advantages. *First*, it brought into union a multitude of nations, differing in customs and language. *Secondly*, it gave freer access to the remotest nations. (4) *Thirdly*, it gradually civilized the barbarous nations; by introducing among them the Roman laws and customs. *Fourthly*, it spread literature, the arts, and philosophy, in countries where they were not before cultivated. All these greatly aided the ambassadors of our Lord, in fulfilling their sacred commission. (5)

§ 4. At the birth of Christ the Roman empire was much freer from commotions, than it had been for many years. For, though I cannot agree with those who think, with *Orosius*, that the temple of Janus was then shut, and the whole world in profound peace; (6) yet there can be no doubt, that the period when our Saviour descended on earth, if compared with the preceding times, was peculiarly peaceful. And according to St. Paul, (7) this peace was very necessary for those, whom Christ commissioned to preach the Gospel.

§ 5. Of the state of those nations which lay without the Roman empire, historic records will not allow us to give so full an account. Nor is it very necessary to our purpose. It is sufficient to know, that the oriental nations were pressed down by a

(2) See Sir *W. Mogle's* Essay on the constitution of the Rom. government, in his posth. works, vol. I. p. 1—48. Lond. 1726. 8vo.—*Scip. Maffei Verona illustrata*, Lib. II. p. 65. [*Petri Giannone*, Histoire civile du royaume de Naples, vol. I. p. 3 &c. *Schl.*]

(3) [See *P. Burmann*, de Vectigalibus populi Romani, cap. ix. p. 123 &c. *Schl.*]

(4) See *Nic. Bergier*, Histoire des grands chemins de l'empire Romain, 2d ed. Brussels 1728, 4to.—and *Everard Otto*, de Tutela viarum publicarum, Pt. II. p. 314.

(5) *Origen*, among others, acknowledges this: lib. II. adv. Celsum, p. 79. ed. Cantabr. [See also *Heilmann*, Comment. de florente litterarum statu et habitu ad relig. Christi initia. *Schl.*]

(6) See *Joh. Massoni* Templum Jani, Christo nascente, reseratum. Roterod. 1706. 8vo.

(7) See 1 Tim. ii. 1. &c.

stern despotism, which their effeminacy of mind and body, and even their religion, led them to bear with patience: while the more northern nations enjoyed much greater liberty; which was protected by the rigor of their climate and the consequent energy of their constitutions, aided by their mode of life and their religion.(8)

§ 6. All these nations were plunged in the grossest superstition. For, though the idea of one supreme God was not wholly extinct,(9) yet most nations, or rather all except the Jews, supposed that each country and province was subjected to a set of very powerful beings, whom they called gods, and whom the people, in order to live happily, must propitiate with various rites and ceremonies. These deities were supposed to differ materially from each other, in sex, power, nature and offices. Some nations indeed, went beyond others in impiety and absurdity of worship, but all stood chargeable with irrationality, and gross stupidity, in matters of religion.

§ 7. Thus every nation had a class of deities peculiar to itself; among which, one was supposed to be preeminent over the rest and was their king, though subject himself to the laws of *fate*, or to an eternal destiny. For the oriental nations had not the same gods as the Gauls, the Germans, and the other northern nations: and the Grecian deities were essentially different from those of the Egyptians, who worshipped brute animals, plants, and various productions of nature and art.(10) Each nation likewise had its own method of worshipping and propitiating its gods, differing widely from the rites of other nations. But, from their ignorance or other causes, the Greeks and Romans maintained, that *their* gods were universally worshipped: and they therefore gave the names of their own gods to the foreign deities; which has caused immense confusion and obscurity, in the history of the ancient re-

(8) *Seneca*, de Ira. Lib. II. cap. 16. Opp. tom. I. p. 36 ed. Gronovii: Fere itaque imperia penes eos fuere populos, qui mitiore cœlo utuntur: in frigora, septentrionemque vergentibus immansueta ingenia sunt, ut ait poeta, *suoque similima cœlo*.

(9) [See *Christopher Meiners' Historia doctrinæ de vero Deo, omnium rerum auctore atque rectore*. 2 parts, Lemgo. 1780. pp. 548. 12mo. where, from a critical investigation, proof is adduced, that the ancient pagan nations were, universally, ignorant of the Creator and Governor of the world; till *Anaxagoras*, about 450 years before Christ, and afterwards other philosophers, conceived that the world must have had an intelligent architect. Tr.]

(10) This was long since remarked by *Athanasius*, Oratio contra gentes, Opp. tom. I. p. 25. [See *Le Clerc*, Ars critica, Pt. II. Sect. I. c. 13. § 11. and *Bibliothèque Choisie*, tom. VII. p. 84. *W. Warburton's* Divine legation of Moses demonstrated, tom. II. p. 233 &c.—And respecting the Egyptian gods, see *P. E. Jablonsky*, Pantheon Ægyptiorum, Francf. ad Viadr. 1750. 8vo. *F. S. von Schmidt*, Opuscula, quibus res antiquæ, præcipue Ægyptiæ explanantur. 1765. 8vo. *Schl.*]

ligions, and produced numberless errors, in the works of very learned men.(11)

§ 8. But this variety of Gods and religions in the pagan nations, produced no wars or feuds among them; unless, perhaps, the Egyptians are an exception.(12) Yet the Egyptian wars, waged to avenge their gods, cannot properly be called religious wars, not being undertaken either to propagate or to suppress any one form of religion. Each nation, without concern, allowed its neighbors to enjoy their own views of religion, and to worship their own gods in their own way. Nor need this tolerance greatly surprise us.(13) For they who regard the world as being divided, like a great country, into numerous provinces, each subject to a distinct order of deities, cannot despise the gods of other nations; nor think of compelling all others to pay worship to their own *national* gods. The Romans, in particular, though they would not allow the public religions to be changed or multiplied, yet gave the citizens full liberty, in private, to observe foreign religions; and to hold meetings and feasts, and erect temples and groves, to those foreign deities in whose worship there was nothing inconsistent with the public safety and the existing laws.(14)

§ 9. The greater part of the gods of all nations were ancient heroes, famous for their achievements and their worthy deeds; such as kings, generals, and founders of cities; and likewise females who were highly distinguished for their deeds and discoveries, whom a grateful posterity had deified. To these, some added the more splendid and useful objects in the natural world: among which, the sun, moon and stars, being preeminent, received worship from nearly all; and some were not ashamed to pay divine honors to mountains, rivers, trees, the earth, the ocean, the winds, and even to diseases, to virtues and vices, and to almost

(11) [Dr. *MacLaine* here subjoins a long note, asserting that the gods, worshipped in different pagan countries, were so similar, that they might properly be called by the same names. He therefore thinks, Dr. *Mosheim* has overrated the mischief done to the history of idolatry, by the Greek and Roman writers. But there was, certainly, little resemblance between Woden and Mercury, Thor and Jupiter, Friga and Venus; or between the Roman deities and Brumha, Vishnoo, Siva and the other gods of Hindostan. And as the classic writers give very imperfect descriptions of foreign deities, and leave us to infer most of their characteristics from the names assigned them, it is evident that Dr. *Mosheim*'s remark is perfectly just. *Tr.*]

(12) See what *Laur. Pignorius* has collected on this subject, in his *Expositio mensæ Isiæ*, p. 41 &c.

(13) [Though extolled by *Schaftsbury*, among others, *Characteristics* vol. II. p. 166. & vol. III. p. 60, 86, 87, 154 &c. *Schl.*]

(14) See *Corn. à Bynckershoeckh*, *Dissert. de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos*, in his *Opuscula*, L. Bat. 1719. 4to. [*Warburton's* *Divine legation of Moses*, vol. I. p. 307.—Compare *Livy*, *Hist. Rom. Lib.* xxv. 1. and xxxix. 18. and *Valer. Max.* I. 3. *Schl.*—See also *N. Lardner*, *Credib. of Gospel hist.* Pt. I B. I. c. 8. § 3—6. *Tr.*]

every conceivable object,—or, at least, to the deities supposed to preside over these objects.(15)

§ 10. The worship of these deities consisted in numerous ceremonies, with sacrifices, offerings and prayers. The ceremonies were for the most part, absurd and ridiculous; and throughout, debasing, obscene and cruel. The sacrifices and offerings varied, according to the nature and offices of the different gods.(16) Most nations sacrificed animals; and not a few of them, likewise, immolated human victims.(17) Their prayers were truly insipid, and void of piety, both in their form and matter.(18) Over this whole worship, presided, pontiffs, priests and servants of the gods, divided into many classes; and whose business it was, to see that the rites were duly performed. These were supposed to enjoy the friendship and familiar converse of the gods; and they basely abused their authority, to impose on the people.

§ 11. The religious worship of most nations, was confined to certain *places* or temples;(19) and to certain *times* or stated days. In the temples, [and groves,] the statues and images of their gods were located; and these images were supposed to be animated, in an inexplicable manner, by the gods themselves. For, senseless as these worshippers of imaginary gods truly were, they did not wish to be accounted worshippers of lifeless substances, brass, stone and wood; but of a deity, which they maintained to be present in the image, provided it was consecrated in due form.(20)

§ 12. Besides this common worship, to which all had free access, there were, among both orientals and Greeks, certain recondite and concealed rites, called *mysteries*; to which very few were admitted. Candidates for initiation had first to give satisfactory proof to the hierophants of their good faith and patience, by various most troublesome ceremonies. When initiated, they could not divulge any thing they had seen, without exposing their

(15) See the learned work of G. J. Vossius, de Idololatria, Lib. i—iii. [and La mythologie et les fables expliquées par l'histoire, par l'Abbé Banier, Paris 1733—40. 8 vol. 12mo. and Fr. Creutzers' Symbolik u. Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen. Leipz. u. Darmst. 1810—12. 4 vol. 8vo. Tr.]

(16) See J. Saubertus, de Sacrificiis veterum; republished by T. Crenius, L. Bat. 1699. 8vo.

(17) See H. Columna, ad Fragmenta Ennii. p. 29.—and J. Saubertus, de Sacrificiis Vet. cap. xxi. p. 455.

(18) See Matt. Browerius à Niedeck, de Adorationibus veterum populorum. Traj. 1711. 8vo. [and Saubertus, ubi supra, p. 343, &c. Schl.]

(19) [“Some nations were without temples, such as the Persians, Gauls, Germans, and Britons, who performed their religious worship in the open air, or in the shady retreats of consecrated groves.” Macl.]

(20) Arnobius, adv. Gentes, Lib. vi. p. 254, ed. Herald. Augustine, de Civitate Dei, Lib. vii. c. 33. Opp. tom. vii. p. 161, ed. Benedict. Julian, Misopogon. p. 361, ed. Spanhem.

lives to imminent danger.(21) Hence it is, that the interior of these hidden rites is, at this day, little known. Yet we know, that in some of the mysteries, many things were done which were repugnant to modesty and decency; and in all of them, the discerning might see, that the deities there worshipped, were more distinguished for their vices, than for their virtues.(22)

§ 13. The whole pagan system had not the least efficacy, to produce and cherish virtuous emotions in the soul. For in the *first* place, the gods and goddesses to whom the public homage was paid, were patterns, rather of preeminent vitiosity, than of virtue.(23) They were considered, indeed, as superior to mortals in power, and as exempt from death; but in all things else, as on a level with us. In the *next* place, the ministers of this religion, neither by precept, nor by example, exhorted the people to lead honest and virtuous lives; but gave them to understand, that all the homage required of them by the gods, was comprised in the observance of the traditional rites and ceremonies.(24) And *lastly*, the doctrines inculcated, respecting

(21) See Jo. Meursius, de *Mysteriis Eleusyniis*; and David Clarkson, *Discourse on Liturgies*, § IV.

(22) Cicero, *Disput. Tusculan.* Lib. i. cap. 13. [and de *Leg.* cap. 24. Varro, cited by Augustine, de *Civitate Dei*, Lib. iv. cap. 31. Eusebius, *Praeparat. Evangel.* lib. ii. c. 3. Schl.—See also Warburton's *Divine legat.* vol. I. Lib. ii. sec. 4. who is confronted by J. Leland, *Advantages and necessity of the Christian Rev.* vol. I. ch. 8, 9. p. 151—190.—C. Meiners, *über die Mysterien der Alten*; in his *Miscel. philos. works*, vol. III. Leipz. 1776. The Baron de *Sainte Croix*, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion secrète des anciens peuples &c.* Paris 1784. 8vo. and (P. J. Vogel's) *Briefe über die Mysterien*; which are the 2d. collection of *Letters on Freemasonry*, Nuremb. 1784. 12mo.—It has been maintained, that the design of at least some of these mysteries, was, to inculcate the grand principles of natural religion; such as the unity of God, the immortality of the soul, the importance of virtue, &c. and to explain the vulgar polytheism as symbolical of these great truths. But this certainly needs better proof. It is more probable, that the later pagan philosophers, who lived after the light of christianity had exposed the abominations of polytheism, resorted to this subterfuge, in order to vindicate the character of their predecessors. Tr.]

(23) Ovid, de *Tristibus*. Lib. ii. v. 287 &c.

Quis locus est templis augustior? hæc quoque vitet,

In culpam si qua est ingeniosa suam.

Cùm steterit Jovis æde, Jovis succurret in æde,

Quàm multas matres fecerit ille Deus.

Proxima adoranti Junonia templa subibit,

Pellicibus multis hanc doluisse Deam.

Pallade conspectâ, natum de crimine virgo

Sustulerit quare quæret Erichthonium.

[Compare Plato, de *Leg.* Lib. i. p. 776. and, de *Republ.* Lib. ii. p. 430 &c. ed. Ficini. Isocrates, *Encom. Busiridis*, Oratt. p. 462. and Seneca, de *Vita beata*, cap. 26. Schl.]

(24) See J. Barbeyrac, *Preface* to his French translation of Puffendorf's *Law of nature and nations*. § VI. [Yet there were some intelligent pagans who had better views, as Socrates and the younger Pliny. The latter in his *Panegyric on Trajan*, cap. 3. n. 5. says: Animadverto,—etiam Deos ipsos, non tam accuratis adorantium precibus, quàm innocentiam et sanctitate lætari: gratioremque ex-

the rewards of the righteous and the punishments of the wicked, in the future world, were some of them dubious and uncertain, and others more adapted to promote vice than virtue.(25) Hence the wiser pagans themselves, about the time of the Saviour's birth, contemned and ridiculed the whole system.

§ 14. And hence a universal corruption of morals prevailed, and crimes which at this day cannot be named, with decency, were then practiced, with entire impunity.(26) Those who would see proof of this, may read *Juvenal* and *Perseus*, among the Latins, and *Lucian* among the Greeks: or, if this seems too painful, let them reflect on the gladiatorial shows, the sodomy and unnatural lusts, the facility of divorce, both among Greeks and Romans, the custom of exposing infants and procuring abortions, and the stews consecrated to the gods;—against all which, the laws raised no obstructions.(27)

§ 15. Men of but common discernment, could see the deformity of these religions: but they were met by the crafty priests, with two spurious arguments. *First*, the miracles and prodigies which were affirmed to have taken place, and still to be daily witnessed in the temples and before the shrines of the gods: and *secondly*, the divination and oracles, by which these gods were said to have foretold future events. In regard to both, the common people were miserably imposed upon, by the artifices of the priests; and the discerning saw it.(28) But the latter had to

istimari, qui delubris eorum puram castamque mentem, quàm qui meditatam carmen intulerit. Schl.]

(25) [What the Greeks and Romans said of the Elysian Fields, was not only fabulous in its very aspect, but it held out the prospect of voluptuous pleasures, opposed to true virtue. The more northern nations promised a happy immortality only to those, who distinguished themselves by a martial spirit, and the slaughter of numerous foes; that is, to the enemies of mankind. And the eternal bliss, which they promised to these warriors, was only a continued indulgence in vile lusts. How could such hopes excite to virtue?—Moreover, the doctrine of even these rewards and punishments, was not an article of faith, among the Greeks and Romans; but every one believed what he pleased concerning it: and, at the time of Christ's birth, the followers of *Epicurus* were numerous, and while many denied, most others doubted, the reality of future retributions. *Polybius*, Hist. Lib. v. 54. *Sallust*, Bell. Catil. Schl.]

(26) *Cyprian*, Epist. i. p. 2. ed. Baluz. describes at large the debased morals of the pagans. See also *Cornelii Adami Exercit. de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus*; in his *Exercitt. Exeget. Exercit. V. Gröning. 1712. 4to.* [and, what is still better authority, *St. Paul*, to the Romans, chap. i. *passim. Tr.*]

(27) [On the subject of this and several preceding sections, the reader may find satisfactory proof, in that elaborate and candid work: The advantage and necessity of the Christian Revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world; by *J. Leland, D. D.* 2d. ed. Dublin, 1765. 2 vol. 8vo. *Tr.*]

(28) [*Schlegel* here introduces a long note, showing that Dr. *Mosheim*, till towards the close of his life, did not utterly reject that common opinion of the ancients, that *evil spirits* sometimes aided the pagan priests, particularly in regard to their oracles. But Dr. *Mosheim* did, we are told by his pupil, come at

laugh with caution, in order to be safe. For the priests stood ready to accuse of treason against the gods, before a raging and superstitious multitude, all such as exposed their religious frauds.

§ 16. At the time chosen by the Son of God for his birth among men, the Roman religion as well as arms, pervaded a large part of the world. To be acquainted with this religion, is nearly the same as to be acquainted with the Grecian superstition.(29) Yet there is some difference between them: for, besides the institutions of Numa and others, invented for political ends, the Romans superadded to the Grecian fables some Italic and Tuscan fictions; and also gave the Egyptian gods a place among their deities.(30)

§ 17. In the Roman provinces, new forms of paganism were gradually produced, compounded of the ancient religions of the inhabitants, and that of their Roman conquerors. For these nations, who before their subjugation had their peculiar gods and religious rites, were persuaded by degrees to adopt many of the Roman usages. This was good policy in the Romans, whose interests were promoted by the extinction of the inhuman rites of the barbarous nations; and the levity of those nations, and their desire to please their masters, favored the object.(31)

§ 18. The most prominent religions beyond the bounds of the Roman empire, may be divided into two classes, the *civil* and the *military*. To the first class, belong the religions of most of the oriental nations, especially of the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Indians. For, whoever carefully inspects their religions, will see, that they are adapted merely to answer political objects; to protect the dignity and authority of kings, to preserve the public tranquillity, and to promote the civil virtues. To the second class, must be referred the religions of the northern nations. For all that was inculcated, among the Germans, Britains, Celts, Goths, &c. respecting the gods and the worship due to them, was evidently suited to awaken and to cherish the military virtues, fortitude, bravery, and contempt of death. A careful examination of these religions, will fully verify these statements.

§ 19. No nation was so rude and barbarous, as not to contain

last into the opinion now generally admitted, namely, that the pagan oracles were all mere cheats, proceeding from the craft of the priests. See *Van Dale*, de *Oraculis ethnicorum*: among his *Diss.* Amstel. 1696. 4to. and *Bern. Fontenelle*, *Histoire des oracles*. 1687. with the Jesuit, *J. F. Baltus*, *Réponse à l'histoire des oracles*, &c. Strasb. 1707. 8vo and *Suite de la Réponse*, &c. 1708. 8vo. Tr.]

(29) See *Dionys. Halicar.* *Antiquitatt. Romanor.* Lib. vii. cap. 72. tom. I. p. 460. ed. Hudson.

(30) See *Sam. Petitus*, ad *Leges Atticas*, Lib. i. Tit i. p. 71. [*Lactantius*, *Divinarum Institutt.* Lib. i. cap. 20. *Schl.*]

(31) [*Strabo*, *Geograph.* Lib. iv. p. 189 &c. *Schl.*]

some persons, who had sagacity to discern the absurdity of the popular religions. But some of these men lacked the power and authority, others the disposition, and all the wisdom, necessary to produce a reformation. This could not well be better illustrated, than it is by the attempts to reform the vulgar superstitions, made by the Greek and Roman philosophers. They advanced many tolerably correct ideas respecting the divine nature, and moral duties; and with some success, they exposed the errors of the prevailing religion; but all was so intermixed with wild and baseless speculations, as clearly to show, that it belongs to God only, and not to men, to teach the truth, undebased and free from errors.

§ 20. Among the more civilized nations, at the time the Son of God appeared, two species of philosophy prevailed; namely, the *Grecian*, which was also adopted by the Romans; and the *oriental*, which had many followers in Persia, Syria, Chaldaea, Egypt, and among the Jews. The former was appropriately called *philosophy*: the latter, by such as spoke Greek, was called *γνῶσις*, that is, *knowledge*, namely *Θεῶν*, of God; because its followers pretended to restore the lost knowledge of the supreme God.(32) The advocates of both kinds of philosophy, were split into numerous contending sects; yet with this difference, that all the sects of oriental philosophy set out with one and the same fundamental principle; and therefore were agreed in regard to many points of doctrine; but the Greeks disagreed about the very first principles of all human wisdom.—Of the oriental philosophy, we shall give account hereafter: of the Grecian philosophy, and its sects, notice will be taken here.

§ 21. Some of the Grecian sects declared open war against all religion: others admitted indeed the existence of God, and of religion; but obscured the truth, rather than threw light upon it. Of the former class, were the *Epicureans*, and the *Academics*. The Epicureans maintained, that the world arose from chance; that the gods (whose existence they did not dare to deny,) neither did, nor could, extend their providential care to human affairs; that the soul was mortal; that *pleasure*(33) was to be sought as man's

(32) *St. Paul* mentions and disapproves both kinds of philosophy; namely, the Grecian, Colos. ii. 8. and the oriental, or *γνῶσις*, 1 Tim. vi. 20. [Dr. *Mosheim* has been censured for his confident assertions, in regard to the existence and prevalence of an oriental philosophy, going under the name of *γνῶσις*, so early as the days of *Christ* and his apostles. On this subject more will be said hereafter. *Tr.*]

(33) [“The ambiguity of the word *pleasure*, has produced many disputes in the explication of the Epicurean system. If by *pleasure*, be understood only *sensual* gratifications, the tenet here advanced is indisputably monstrous. But if it be taken in a larger sense, and be extended to intellectual and moral objects;

ultimate end; and that virtue was to be prized only for its subserviency to this end. The Academics denied the possibility of arriving at truth and certainty; and therefore, held it uncertain, whether the gods existed, or not; whether the soul is mortal, or survives the body; whether virtue is preferable to vice, or the contrary.(34) These two sects, when Jesus was born, were very numerous and influential; being favored by men of rank, especially, and by nearly all the opulent.(35)

in what does the scheme of Epicurus, with respect to virtue, differ from the opinions of those christian philosophers, who maintain that *self-love* is the only spring of all human affections and actions?" *Macl.* Epicurus distinguished between *corporeal* pleasure and *mental*. But he accounted both *sensitive*; because he held the soul to be *material*. His conceptions of pleasure, did not extend beyond *natural pleasures*; the chief of which, he supposed to be a calm and tranquil state of *mind*, undisturbed by any fear of God, or any solicitude about the future; and attended with freedom from bodily pain. His system, therefore, denied the very idea of *moral* or *religious* pleasures; and it required *atheism*, as its foundation. See *Stäudlin's* Geschich. d. Moralphilos. p. 230, &c. Hanov. 1822. 8vo. *Tr.*]

(34) [The Academics, or Platonists, became indeed sceptical; especially those of the Middle Academy. Some real Pyrrhonists, likewise assumed the name of Academics. Still it is probable, the great body of Academics, like *Cicero*, who is accounted one of them, merely held that all human knowledge is *imperfect*; that is, falls short of certainty; that of course, we are obliged in all cases, to act upon *probabilities*; of which there are different degrees. *Tr.*]

(35) The Epicureans were the most numerous of the two. See *Cicero*, de Finibus bonor. at malor. Lib i. cap. 7. Lib. ii. cap. 14. and Disput. Tuscul. Lib. v. cap. 10. Hence *Juvenal*, Satyr. xiii. v. 86, &c. thus complains of the many atheists at Rome:

Sunt in fortunæ qui casibus omnia ponant,
Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
Naturâ volvente vices et lucis et anni:

Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque altaria tangunt.

[Dr. *Mosheim*, in these sections, is giving the dark side of pagan philosophy. Like his other translators, therefore, I would aim so to soften his pictures, that the less informed reader may not be misled. This, I am persuaded, Dr. *Mosheim* would himself approve; as may be inferred from the following long note, inserted apparently for such a purpose, in the parallel passage of his *Commentarii de Reb. Christ. ante Constant.* p. 17, 18. "I cannot agree with those who maintain, that every one of the philosophers of those times, even such as discoursed well on religious subjects, were hostile to all religion. I think those learned moderns have gone too far, who have endeavored to prove, that every sect of the philosophers, either openly or covertly, aimed to rip up the foundations of all religion. Are we to believe, that not one of the many great and worthy men of those times, however free from ill intentions, was so fortunate as to make a proper use of his reason? Must all those who professed theism, and spoke sublimely of the divine perfections, be regarded as impostors, who said one thing, and meant another? Yet the celebrated and acute *W. Warburton*, to mention no others, lately expended much ingenuity and learning, to bring us to such conclusions. See his very elaborate and noted work, entitled *The divine Legation &c.* Vol. I. p. 332 &c. and p. 419 &c. He would have us think, that all the philosophers who taught the immortality of the soul, secretly denied it; that they held *nature* to be the only Deity; and human souls to be particles, severed from the soul of the world, to which they return at the death of the body. But not to mention that he cites only Grecian philosophers, while other nations had their philosophers also, differing widely from the Grecian; the renowned author depends not on plain and explicit testimony, which seems requisite to justify so heavy a charge, but merely on conjectures, on single examples, and on inferences from

§ 22. To the second class, belong the *Aristolians*, *Stoics* and *Platonics*; none of whom spoke of God, religion, and moral duties, in a manner to be of much service to mankind. The god of *Aristotle* is like the principle of motion in a machine. He is a being, regardless of human affairs, and happy in his own contemplations. Such a god, differing but little from the god of *Epicurus*, we have no reason either to love or to fear. Whether this philosopher held the soul to be mortal, or immortal, is at least doubtful.(36) Now what solid and sound precepts of virtue and piety, can that man give, who denies the providence of God; and not obscurely intimates that the soul is mortal?

§ 23. The god of the *Stoics* has a little more of majesty; nor does he sit musing supinely, above the heavens and the stars. Yet he is described as a *corporeal* being, united to matter by a necessary connexion; and moreover, as subject to *fate*:—so that he can neither reward nor punish.(37) That this sect held to the extinction of the soul at death, is allowed by all the learned. Now such doctrines take away the strongest motives to virtue. And accordingly, the moral system of the *Stoics*, is a *body* that is fair and beautiful, but without sinews and active limbs.(38)

§ 24. *Plato* seems to have exceeded all the other philosophers, in wisdom. For he held the world to be governed by an independent, powerful, and intelligent God; and he taught men

the doctrines held by certain philosophers. If this kind of proof be allowed, if single instances, and inferences, are sufficient to convict men of duplicity, when no shadow of suspicion appears in their language, who will be found innocent? Though but an ordinary man, and far inferior to Warburton, yet I could prove, that all the theologians in christendom disbelieve, utterly, what they teach in public; and that they covertly aim to instill the poison of impiety into men's minds; if I might be allowed to assail them in the manner this learned writer assails the philosophers." *Tr.*]

(36) See the notes on my Latin translation of *R. Cudworth's Intellectual system*: tom. I. p. 66. 500. tom. II. p. 1171. and *Mich. Mourgues*, *Plan theologique du Pythagorisme*. tom. I. p. 75 &c.

(37) ["Thus is the Stoical doctrine of *fate* generally represented; but not more generally, than unjustly. Their *fatum*, when carefully and attentively examined, seems to have signified no more, in the intention of the wisest of that sect, than the plan of government formed originally in the divine mind, a plan all wise and perfect; and from which, of consequence, the supreme Being, morally speaking, can never depart. So that when Jupiter is said by the *Stoics* to be subject to immutable *fate*, this means no more than that he is subject to the wisdom of his own counsels, and acts ever in conformity with his supreme perfections. The following remarkable passage of *Seneca*, drawn from the Vth. chapter of his book *De providentia*, is sufficient to confirm the explication we have here given of the *Stoical fate*. Ille ipse omnium conditor et rector, *scripsit quidem fata*, sed sequitur. Semper paret, semel jussit." *Macl.* This fine apology will not bear a strict scrutiny. The *Stoics* themselves differed in opinion; and they generally had indistinct notions. But most of them held *fate* to be rather a *physical*, than a *moral*, necessity; though some of them, at times, confounded it with Jove, nature, or a pantheistic god, as *Seneca* does in the passage quoted. *Tr.*]

(38) These remarks receive some illustration from my note on *Cudworth's Intel. Syst.* tom. I. p. 517.

what to fear, and what to hope for, after death. Yet his doctrines, not only rest on very slender foundations, and are exceedingly obscure, but they represent the supreme Creator as destitute of several perfections,(39) and as limited to a certain place. His doctrine concerning demons and the human soul, is singularly adapted to produce and encourage superstition.(40) Nor will his system of morals command very high estimation, if we examine it in all its parts, and inquire into its first principles.(41)

§ 25. As all these sects held many things inconsistent with sound reason, and were addicted to never ending contentions and debates, some moderate and well disposed men concluded to follow none of them implicitly, but to glean from *all*, whatever was good and consonant to reason, and reject the rest. Hence originated in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria, a new mode of philosophising, called the *eclectic*. One *Potamon* of Alexandria, has been represented as its author; but the subject has its difficulties.(42) That this sect flourished at Alexandria, in the age of our Savior, is manifest from the Jewish *Philo*, who philosophised according to its principles.(43) These *Eclectics* held *Plato* in the highest estimation; but they unscrupulously modified his doctrines, by incorporating what they pleased from the other philosophers.(44)

(39) [He ascribed to God, neither omnipotence, nor omnipresence, nor omniscience. *Schl.* But Dr. *Maclaine* here enters his dissent. He says: "All the divine perfections are frequently acknowledged by that philosopher." I wish he had given proof of this assertion, if he was able to make it good. *Tr.*]

(40) [He believed that God employs good and evil demons, in the government of the world; and that men can have commerce with these demons. A person believing this, may easily be led to regard idolatry, as not altogether irrational. *Schl.*]

(41) The defects of the Platonic philosophy are copiously, but not very accurately, depicted by *Fran. Baltus*, in a French work, *Defense des peres accuses de Platonisme*, Paris 1711. 4to. [*Plato* has moreover, been accused of *Spinozism*. For *Bayle* (*Continuation des pensées diverses sur la Comete &c.* cap. 25.) and *Gundling*, (in *Otiis*, fasc. 2. and in *Gundlingianis*. Th. 43, 45,) tax him with confounding God with matter. But *Zimmerman* (*Opuscula*, tom. I. p. 762 &c.) and the elder *Schellhorn* (*Amœnitatt. litterar.* tom. IX, XII and XIII.) have defended the character of *Plato*. *Schl.*]

(42) [*J. Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.* tom. II. p. 193. has shown, that in regard to the controversies maintained by *Heumann*, *Hasæus* and others, respecting this nearly unknown *Potamon*, the probability is, that he lived about the close of the second century; that his speculations had little effect; and that *Ammonius* is to be regarded as the founder of the *Eclectic* sect. Yet this will not forbid our believing, what *Brucker* himself admits, that there were *some* Grecian philosophers, as early as the times of Christ, who speculated very much as the *Eclectics* afterwards did; though the few followers they had, did not merit the title of a sect. *Schl.*]

(43) [For he philosophized in the manner of *Clemens Alex.* *Origen*, and the other christian doctors, who were certainly *Eclectics*. For the most part, he follows *Plato*: and hence many account him a pure Platonist. But he often commends the Stoics, Pythagoreans and others, and adopts their opinions. *Schl.*]

(44) [See *Godfr. Olearius*, de *Philosophia Eclectica*; *James Brucker* and oth-

§26. It will be easy to see, what inference should be drawn from this account of the lamentable state of the world at the time of Christ's birth. It may serve to teach us, that the human race was then, wholly corrupt; and stood in need of a divine teacher, to instruct mankind in the true principles of religion and morality, and to recall the wanderers into the paths of virtue and piety. And it may teach those, who before were ignorant of it, how great the advantages and supports, in all circumstances of life, the human family have derived from the advent of Christ, and from the religion which he taught. Many despise and ridicule the christian religion; not knowing that, to it they are indebted for all the blessings they enjoy.

ers. [On the philosophy, as well as the vulgar polytheism of the ancient pagans, the best work for the mere English reader, seems to be that already mentioned, *N. Lardner's* Advantage and necessity of the christian revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world. 2d. ed. 1765. 2 vol. 8vo.—The history of philosophy among the ancients, has not been critically and ably written, in English, nor by Englishmen. *Stanley's* lives &c. 1655. 4to. is full of mistakes; and *Enfield's* abridgment of Brucker, is quite superficial. The best general works, are *J. Brucker's* Historia critica philosophiæ, Lips. 1741—67. 6 vol. 4to. and the more recent German works by *Tiedemann*, (7 vol. 8vo. 1791—96.) *Buhle*, (7 vol. 8vo. 1800.) *Tenneman* (12 vol. 8vo. 1798—1810.) and *Rixner* 3 vol. 8vo. 1822. The history of moral philosophy, or ethics, is well treated by *Cp. Meiners*, (krit. Geschichte, 2 Vol. 8vo. 1800—1.) and *C. F. Staudlin*, Gesch. der Moralphilosophie, 1822. pp. 1055, 8vo. Tr.]

CHAPTER II.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE JEWS AT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

§ 1. Herod the Great then reigned.—§ 2. State of the Jews after his death.—§ 3. Their troubles and calamities,—§ 4. which were increased by their leading men.—§ 5. Their religion greatly corrupted, both among the common people,—§ 6. and among their teachers, who were divided into three sects.—§ 7 Their dissensions.—§ 8. Their toleration of each other.—§ 9. The Essenes.—§ 10. The Therapeutæ.—§ 11. Moral doctrines of these sects.—§ 12. Low state of religion among the people.—§ 13. The Kabala, a source of error.—§ 14. Their form of worship, debased by pagan rites.—§ 16. Causes of the corruption of the nation.—§ 15.—Yet religion not wholly extinct.—§ 17. The Samaritans.—§ 18. State of the Jews out of Palestine.

§ 1. The state of the Jewish people, among whom the Savior chose to be born, was little better than that of other nations. *Herod*, whose crimes procured him the title of the *Great*, then governed, or rather oppressed the nation; being a tributary king under the Romans. He drew on himself universal hatred, by his cruelties, jealousies, and wars; and exhausted the wealth of the unhappy nation, by his mad luxury, his excessive magnificence, and his immoderate largesses. Under his administration, Roman luxury and great licentiousness spread over Palestine.(1) In religion, he was professedly a Jew; but he copied the manners of those who despise all religion.

§ 2. On the death of this tyrant, the Romans allowed *Archelaus*, his son, with the title of *Exarch*, to reign over half of Palestine; [viz. Judea, Samaria, and Idumea;] the other half was divided between two other sons of Herod, *Antipas* and *Philip*. Archelaus copied after the vices of his father; and was, therefore, in the tenth year of his reign, publicly accused before Augustus, and deprived of his crown.(2) The countries he had governed were now reduced to the form of a Roman province; and were annexed to Syria. This change in their form of government, brought heavy troubles and calamities upon the Jews, and at last destroyed the nation.

(1) See *Christ. Noldii Historia Idumæa*, in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus, tom. II. p. 333 &c. *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. I. Pt. I. p. 27 &c. *H. Norris*, Cœnotaph. Pisan. II. 6. *H. Prideaux*, Connexions &c. Pt. II. Lib. viii. *Chr. Cellarius*, Historia Herodum, in his Diss. Acad. Pt. I. and especially, the Jewish historian, *Fl. Josephus*, in his Wars of the Jews.

(2) [*Josephus* Antiq. Jud. Lib. xvii. cap. 13. and de Bell. Jud. Lib. ii. cap. 6. Schl.]

§ 3. The Romans did not, indeed, wholly prohibit the Jews from retaining their national laws, and the religion established by Moses. Their religious affairs were still conducted by a High Priest, with priests and levites under him; and by their national senate or Sanhedrim. The exterior of their worship, with a few exceptions, remained unaltered. But the amount of evil, resulting to this miserable people, from the presence of Romans among them who were in their view polluted and detestable, from the cruelty and avarice of the governors, and from the frauds and rapacity of the publicans, is almost incalculable. Unquestionably, those lived more comfortably, who were subject to the other two sons of Herod.

§ 4. But the measure of liberty and comfort, allowed to the Jews by the Romans, was wholly dissipated by the profligacy and crimes of those, who pretended to be patriots and guardians of the nation. Their principal men, their High Priests, (as we learn from Josephus,) were abandoned wretches; who had purchased their places by bribes, or by deeds of iniquity; and who maintained their ill-acquired authority, by every species of flagitious acts. The other priests, and all those who held any considerable office, were not much better. The multitude, excited by such examples, ran headlong into every sort of iniquity; and by their unceasing robberies and seditions, armed against them, both the justice of God, and the vengeance of men.(3)

§ 5. Two religions then flourished in Palestine; viz. the *Jewish*, and the *Samaritan*; between the followers of which, a deadly hatred prevailed. The nature of the former is set forth in the Old Testament. But in the age of the Savior, it had lost much of its primitive form and character. The people, universally, were infected with certain prevalent and pernicious errors: and the more learned fiercely contended, on points of the greatest moment. All looked for a deliverer; not however, such a one as God had promised, but a powerful warrior, and a vindicator of their national liberties.(4) All placed the sum of religion in an observance of the Mosaic ritual, and in certain external duties towards their own countrymen. All excluded the rest of mankind from the hope of salvation; and of course, whenever they dared, treated them with hatred and inhumanity.(5) To these

(3) [See *Josephus*, de Bell. Jud. Lib. v. cap. 13. § 6. and *Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. I. cap. 16. *Schl.*]

(4) This is proved by *J. Basnage*, Hist. des Juifs, tom. v. cap. 10. That not only the Pharisees, but all Jews, of whatever sect, both in and out of Palestine, were expecting a Messiah; is shown by Dr. Mosheim, in his commentt. de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 40. from the following texts, John i. 20, 25. x. 24 &c. xii. 34. Matt. ii. 4—6. xxi. 9. xxvi. 63 &c. *Schl.*]

(5) [Hence other nations, not without reason, accounted the Jews as enemies

fruitful sources of vice, must be added various absurd and superstitious opinions, concerning the divine nature, genii, magic, &c. which they had partly brought with them from the Babylonian captivity, and partly imbibed from the neighboring Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians.(6)

§ 6. The learned, who pretended to a superior knowledge of the law and of theology, were divided into various sects and parties ;(7) among which, *three* were most numerous and influen-

of mankind. See the examples collected by J. Elsner *Observatt. Sacr. in N. T. tom. II. p. 274. Schl.*]

(6) See Th. Gale, *Observv. ad Jamblichum, de Myster. Aegypt. p. 206.* and G. Sale, Preface to his Eng. transl. of the Koran. p. 72. Even Josephus, *Antiq. Jud. Lib. iii. c. 7. § 2.* admits that the Jewish religion was corrupted among the Babylonians. *Schl.*]

(7) Besides the three more noted sects, there were others unquestionably, among the Jews. The *Herodians* are mentioned in the sacred volume; the *Gaulonites*, by Josephus; and other sects by Epiphanius, and by Hagesippus in Eusebius; all of which cannot be supposed to be mere fictions. [Dr. Mosheim's additional remarks on this subject, in his *Commentt. de Reb. Chr. ante C. M. p. 43—45.* well deserve insertion here. They are as follows. "To vindicate my assertion, that Epiphanius' account of the Jewish sects, in the beginning of his book *de Hæresibus*, is not, probably, altogether untrue; I will offer a conjecture, which, the more I consider it, the more important it appears. I propose it for the consideration of the learned. It may, perhaps, serve to remove some obscurities from ancient ecclesiastical history. Epiphanius states, that there was among the Jews, a sect of *Hemerobaptists*; who had this peculiarity, that they washed themselves daily. The same sect is mentioned by an ancient writer, Hagesippus, quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. cap. 22.* and by Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph. p. 245.* ed. Jebb. though the latter abridges the name, calling them *Baptists*. Nor is this sect omitted in the Index of Heresies, falsely ascribed to Jerome. The author of the *Clementina*, *Homil. II. c. 23.* says, the founder of the sect was named John, and he had twelve apostles, and thirty chief men, to aid him. The same account occurs in the *Epitome gestorum Petri*, § 26. which is subjoined to the *Clementina*. Either no credit is due to any ancient history, or these numerous and very ancient witnesses, who cannot be suspected of fraud or ignorance, must be believed when they assert, that there was a sect among the Jews, called *Hemerobaptists*. Epiphanius' whole story, therefore, is not to be accounted fabulous.

The descendants of these *Hemerobaptists*, I suspect, are still existing. The learned well know, that there is, in Persia, and India, a numerous and wide spread community, who call themselves *Mendai Ijahi, Disciples of John*. The Europeans call them *Christians of St. John*; because they have some slight knowledge of Christ. By the oriental writers, they are called *Sabbi* or *Sabbian*. Concerning them, Ignatius a Jesu, a Carmelite monk, who lived long among them, has written a book, entitled: *Narratio originis, rituum and errorum Christianorum S. Johannis, &c.* Rome 1652. 8vo. It is no contemptible performance, and contains many things deserving attention; though it is ill-digested, and unpolished in its style. Besides this Ignatius, Bart. Herbelot, (in *Biblioth. Orient. voce Sabi.*) Asseman, (*Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vat.*) Thevenot, and Tavernier. (in their *Travels*.) Engelb. & Kämpfer, (*Amœnitatt. exot. Fasc. II. cap. 11.*) and very recently, Fourmont, (*Hist. of Paris. Acad. of Inscriptions*,) and others, have written largely, concerning these people. Th. Sig. Bayer proposed writing a book respecting them, which perhaps was unfinished at his death. The origin and true character of this sect are still unsettled. That they cannot be classed among christians, is now clear. For, what they know of Christ, they have learned from the Chaldean christians, among whom many of them live; nor do they worship or honor Christ. Most of the moderns incline to regard them as descended from those

tial; namely, the *Pharisees*, the *Sadducees*, and the *Essenes*. The two first are often mentioned in the scriptures: for a knowledge of the *Essenes*, we are indebted to *Josephus* and *Philo*. These principal sects agreed indeed, respecting the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion; but respecting questions of the highest importance, and such as relate to the salvation of the soul, they were engaged in endless contentions. The pernicious effects on the common people, of these dissensions of the learned, may be easily conceived.

Sabians, who are so often mentioned in the Koran of Muhammed, and by Maimonides. But their customs, and their doctrines, are wholly different from those attributed to the *Sabians*; and from their being called *Sabians* by the Muhammedans, nothing can be inferred; because it is well known, that the Arabians apply this name to *all* who reject their religion.

I am inclined to look upon these *Christians of St. John*, as descendants of those *Hemerobaptists*, who were a Jewish sect, about the time of Christ. For this opinion, I offer the following arguments. *First*, They profess to be Jews; and say, their ancestors lived on the banks of the Jordan, whence they were driven by the Muhammedans. This argument, I consider as overthrowing the hypothesis, which makes them to be *Sabians*. *Secondly*, They place their dependance for pardon and salvation, on their frequent bodily ablutions; which was the distinguishing error of the *Hemerobaptists*. At this day, the *Disciples of John*, as they call themselves, are solemnly baptized by their priests, but once a year; whereas the *Hemerobaptists* *daily* purified themselves with water. But it is a fixed principle with them all, to this day, that the oftener they baptize, the holier and more happy are they; and they therefore would all receive baptism, every month, nay, every day, if they could. The avarice of their priests, who will not baptize them without a fee, has rendered the repetition of the rite less frequent. *Thirdly*, the founder of this sect, like that of the *Hemerobaptists*, was named *John*; and has left a book which is preserved with reverence as being divine. It is commonly supposed that this John was John the Baptist, Christ's forerunner, mentioned in the scriptures. Hence many conclude that the *Sabians* are descended from the disciples of *John the Baptist*. So thought *Ignatius a Jesu*. *Narratio de Chr. S. Joh. &c. cap. 2. p. 13 &c.* But, what this sect relate of their *John*, as stated by Ignatius himself, clearly show him to be diverse from the Baptist. For they deny that their *John* suffered death under *Herod*; they say he died a natural death, in a town of Persia, called *Sciuster*, and was buried in the adjacent fields of that town. They state also, that he had a wife, and four children. Only a few of the things they relate of their *John* accord with what our scriptures relate of *John the Baptist*; and these few things, like what they also say of Christ, they doubtless learned from those christians with whom they associated to avoid the oppressions of the Muhammedans; and finding these things not inconsistent with their faith, and being unable, from their extreme ignorance, to refute them, they embraced and still retain them. What degree of weight this supposition of mine deserves, will better appear when the sacred books of this people, and especially the book said to be written by their founder *John*, shall be published. These were, a few years since, introduced into the king's library at Paris; so that we may hope the learned will sooner or later have access to them."—These sacred books of the *Sabians of Hedshar* in Persia, have been examined, with considerable care; see among others *M. Norberg, de religione et ling. Sabæorum, in Commentt. Societ. reg. scient. Gotting. 1780.* The most probable conclusion is, that this people are not to be classed among Jews, christians, or Muhammedans; but are of uncertain origin, and have a religion of their own, compounded of Judaism, christianity, Parsism and Islamism. For a list of the writers who treat of them, see *Nössells. Anweisung &c. §474. and Stäudlin's kirchl. Geographie. Vol. II. p. 705. Tr.]*

§ 7. They disagreed first, respecting the *law* itself, or the rule which God had given them. The *Pharisees* superadded to the *written* law, an *oral* or *unwritten* law, handed down by tradition: which both the *Sadducees* and the *Essenes* rejected, adhering only to the written law. They differed also respecting the *import of the law*. For the Pharisees held to a *double sense* of the scriptures, one the obvious and *literal*, the other recondite and *figurative*: the *Sadducees* held only to the literal sense of the bible: the greater part of the *Essenes* dissented from them both, maintaining that the *words* of the law were of no authority, but that the *things* expressed by them were imagery, indicative of sacred and divine things. To these contests concerning the law, others were added, on subjects of the highest moment, and particularly respecting the punishments and rewards declared in the law. These, the Pharisees held, referred to both the body and the soul, and extended beyond the present life: while the Sadducees held to no future retributions. The Essenes took a middle course, admitting future rewards and punishments, but confining them to the soul, holding that the body consists of a malignant substance, and is the temporary prison of the soul.(8)

§ 8. Notwithstanding these sects contended about points of such vast moment, it does not appear, that they molested each other with any violence, on religious grounds. But this forbearance and moderation, no one, acquainted with the history of those times, will ascribe to noble and generous principles. The Sadducees were supported by the leading men of the nation; and the Pharisees by the common people. Neither sect therefore, could rise up in hostility against the other, without the most imminent hazard. Besides, the Romans, on the least appearance of tumult or sedition, would doubtless have punished the ringleaders with severity. We may add, that the Sadducees were of accommodating, gentlemanly manners; and from the principles of their sect, were averse from all broils and altercations.(9)

§ 9. The *Essenes* could more easily avoid contention with the others, because they lived, for the most part, in retired places, and

(8) [For an account of the three Jewish sects, see *Ja. Trigland*, *Syntagma Trium Scriptorum illustrium* (viz. *Jo. Scaliger*, *Joh. Drusius* and *Nicol. Serarius*), *de Judeorum Sectis*. Delft, 1702. 2 vol. 4to. After these, *Ja. Basnage*, *Hum. Prideaux*, (in their Jewish histories,) and the authors of *Introductions to the books of the N. Test.* (and of works on Jewish Antiquities,) and many others, have described these sects, some more, and some less successfully. *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christianor. ante C. M.* p. 46.]

(9) See *Commentt. de Reb. Chr. ante C. M.* p. 48, where Dr. M. proves from *Josephus*, (*Antiq. Jud. L. xviii. c. 1.* and *L. xiii. c. 10.*) that the Sadducees were all men of wealth; and (from his *Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 8.*) that they had little sympathy for others. Dr. M. thinks he finds the picture of a Pharisee in the rich man described, *Luke xvi. 19.* *Schl.*]

remote from intercourse with mankind. This sect, which was dispersed over Syria, Egypt, and the neighboring countries, held religion to consist in silence, and meditation; and they endeavored, by a strict mode of life, and by various observances, borrowed it would seem from the Egyptians,(10) to raise themselves to higher degrees of virtue. Yet they were not all of the same sentiments. Some lived in celibacy; and made it their care to instruct and educate the children of others. Others married wives—not to gratify their natural propensities, but solely to propagate the human race.(11) Those who lived in Syria, held that God may be propitiated by sacrifices: yet that they must be offered in a very different manner, from what was common among the Jews: whence it appears, *they* did not reject the literal sense of the Mosaic law. But those who inhabited the deserts of Egypt, maintained that *no* sacrifice should be presented to God, except that of a composed mind, absorbed in the contemplation of divine things; which shews that *they* put an allegorical sense upon the whole Jewish law.(12)

§ 10. The *Therapeutæ*, of whom *Philo* wrote a whole book,(13) are commonly reckoned a branch of the *Essene* family; whence the distinction of *practical* and *theoretical* Essenes. But whether this classification is correct, may be doubted. For nothing is discoverable, in the customs or institutions of the *Therapeutæ*, which evinces absolutely, that they were a branch of the *Essenes*; nor has *Philo* so represented them. Who can deny, that other fanatical Jews, besides *Essenes*, might unite together and form a society? But I agree entirely with those who regard the *Therapeutæ* as being Jews, claiming to be true disciples of *Moses*; and as being neither christians nor Egyptians. In reality, they were wild and melancholy enthusiasts, who led a life incongruous, alike, with the law of *Moses* and with sober reason.(14)

(10) See *Lu. Holstenius*, Notes on *Porphry*, de Vita *Pythagoræ*. p. 11. ed. Kuster.

(11) [See *Josephus*, de Bell. Jud. Lib. II. c. 8. § 13. *Schl.*]

(12) See *Mosheim's* note on *Cudworth's* Essay, de Vera notione coenæ Domini, p. 4. subjoined to his Intellectual System.

(13) *Philo*, de Vita contemplativa, in his works, p. 889.

(14) The principal writers concerning the *Therapeutæ*, are mentioned by *J. A. Fabricius*. *Lux Salutar. Evang. toti orbi exor.* cap. iv. p. 55. [The more ample account of the *Therapeutæ*, given by Dr. *Mosheim*, in his *Commentt. de Reb. Chr. &c.* p. 55. &c. is thus abridged by *Schlegel*. “The *Therapeutæ* wished to pass for disciples of *Moses*, notwithstanding their wide departure from him. They gave up all their property, and betook themselves to retired situations, where they lived in solitary huts, without sacrifices, without any external worship, and without labor; mortifying their bodies by fasting, and their souls by unceasing contemplation, in order to bring their heaven-born spirits, now imprisoned in bodies, into light and liberty, and fit them better for the celestial mansions after death. They assembled together, every seventh day of the week; when, after hearing a discourse, and offering prayers, they ate together, feeding

§ 11. It was impossible that any one of these sects should inculcate, and promote, true piety and virtue. The *Pharisees*, as our Savior often laid to their charge, disregarded internal purity; and by a vain ostentation and an austere life, sought for popular applause; and also ascribed more authority to their vain traditions, than to the holy commandments of God. Matt. xxiii. 13, &c. The *Sadducees* gave a stimulus to iniquity, and to every lust, by discarding all future rewards and punishments. The *Essenes*, a fanatic and superstitious tribe, made piety to consist in a holy indolence, and a dislike of mankind; and thus they sun-dered the ties of society.

§ 12. When those who assumed the name and the prerogatives of *the wise*, were involved in such darkness, and such altercations, who can doubt, that the religion and piety of the *common people* was in a low and debased state? They were sunk in deplorable ignorance of divine things; and they supposed that they rendered themselves acceptable to God, by their attention to sacrifices, ablutions, and the other ceremonies prescribed by Moses. From this two-fold source, flowed those polluted morals, and that profligate life, which characterized the greater part of the Jews, while Christ lived among them.(15) Hence our Savior compared *the people* to wandering sheep, who had no shepherd; Matt. x. 6. xv.

on salt and bread and water. This meal was followed by a sacred dance, which they protracted through the night, and till the dawn of day. At first, the men and women danced apart; afterwards, guided by inspiration, they danced together; and labored by violent movements, outcries, songs and voices, to express the love of God, then working in their souls. Into such follies can human nature run, when ignorant of God, and of the nature of man. It is still debated whether these Therapeutæ were christians, Jews, or heathen philosophers. *Eusebius* (Hist. eccles. L. ii. c. 17) regarded them as christian monks, established in Egypt by St. Mark; and many Romish writers, to support the high antiquity of monkery, defend this opinion. The whole of this controversy may be seen in the *Lettres pour et contre la fameuse question, si les solitaires appelés Therapeutes, dont a parle Philon le Juif, étoient Chrétiens*. Paris, 1712. 12mo. The chief advocates of this opinion are *B. de Montfaucon*, in the Notes to his Fr. translation of *Philo*, and *M. le Quien*, *Christianus Oriens*, tom. ii. p. 332. On the other hand, *Scaliger*, *Chamier*, *Lightfoot*, *Daillé*, the two *Basnages*, *Prideaux*, *Ittig*, *Buddens*, *Mosheim*, *Baumgarten*, and recently *J. A. Orsi*, (Hist. eccles. vol. I. p. 77.) and *Mangey* (Preface to *Philo's Works*) have maintained, that they were Jews, and of the sect of *Essenes*. *J. J. Lange*, in a Dissert. published in 1721, maintained, upon very slender grounds, that they were *oriental philosophers*, of melancholy temperament, who had imbibed some Jewish notions. And *Jablonsky*, in an Essay on the subject, accounts these solitaires, *Egyptian priests*, addicted to astrology and other sacred sciences of the Egyptians."—Dr. Mosheim pertinently observes, (Com. de Reb. &c. p. 50,) "The christian monks, who evidently originated in Egypt, borrowed their peculiarities from the *practical Essenes*; for nothing can be more similar, than the rules and regulations of the ancient monks, and those of the *Essenes*, as described by Josephus. On the other hand, the christian solitaires, called *Eremites*, copied after the *theoretical Essenes*, or *Therapeutæ*." Tr.]

(15) [A striking passage relative to the vicious lives of the Jews in our Savior's time, occurs in *Josephus*, Bell. Jud. Lib. X. c. 13. § 6. Schl.]

24. and *their teachers* to blind men, who attempt to guide others, when they cannot guide themselves; Matt. xv. 14. John ix. 39.

§ 13. To all these stains on the character of the Jews when Christ came among them, must be added, the attachment of many of them to the oriental philosophy in regard to the origin of the world, and to the indubitable offspring of that philosophy, the *Kabbala*. That many Jews *were* infected with this system, both the sacred books of the New Testament, and the early history of the christian church prove undeniably.(16) It is certain, that the founders of several *Gnostic* sects were Jews. The followers of this philosophy must, necessarily, have differed from the other Jews, in their views of the God of the Old Testament, and in their views of Moses, of the creation, and of the Messiah. For they held the creator of the world to be a different being from the supreme God: and believed, that the Messiah was to destroy the domination of the former over the human race. From such opinions, a monstrous system must have been formed, widely different from the genuine religion of the Jews.

§ 14. The outward *forms* of worship established by Moses, were less corrupted than the other parts of religion. Yet very learned men have observed, that various rites were introduced into the temple itself, which we may in vain search for in the divine ritual. It appears that the Jews, on becoming acquainted with the sacred rites of the neighboring nations and of the Greeks and Romans, were so captivated with a number of the ceremonies practised in idol worship, that they did not hesitate to adopt them, and to add them as an ornament to the rites of God's appointment.(17)

§ 15. Various *causes* may be assigned for this great corruption of a nation, which God had selected for his peculiar people. In the first place, their fathers had brought back with them from Chaldaea and the adjacent countries, and had introduced into Palestine, many foolish and vain opinions, wholly unknown to the founders of the nation.(18) And from the time of the conquest of Asia by *Alexander* the Great, the customs and dogmas of the Greeks were disseminated among the Persians, the Syrians, the Arabians, and likewise the Jews, among whom letters and philosophy had not before flourished.(19) The excursions also, which many Jews were accustomed to make into the neighboring

(16) See *J. C. Wolf*, Biblioth. Ebraica. Vol. II. L. vii. c. i. § 9. p. 206.

(17) See *Joh. Spencer*, de Legibus ritual. veter. Ebræorum, tom. II. Lib. iv. where he treats particularly of Jewish rites, borrowed from the Gentiles, and not to be found in the Law of God.

(18) See *Tho. Gale*, on *Jamblichus* de mysteriis Aegyptiorum, p. 206. Nor does *Josephus* conceal this fact, Antiq. Jud. L. iii. c. 7. § 2.

(19) [*Le Clerc*, Epist. crit. ix. p. 250. *Schl.*]

countries, especially into Egypt and Phenicia, in pursuit of wealth, caused various errors and fancies of the pagan nations, to spread among the Hebrews. And lastly, *Herod* the Great and his sons, and likewise the Roman procurators and soldiers, undoubtedly planted in the country many foreign institutions and pollutions. Other causes will readily occur, to those acquainted with the Jewish history from the times of the Maccabees.

§ 16. But, notwithstanding their numerous faults, the people generally manifested the strongest attachment to the law of Moses, and were very careful of its honor and authority. Hence they erected throughout the country, houses of worship, called in Greek, *Synagogues*; where the people assembled for prayer, and to listen to the public expounders of the law. Schools also were established in the principal towns, where literary men instructed the youth, in both divine and human knowledge.(20) No one can doubt, that these institutions had considerable influence to preserve the law inviolate, and to check in some degree the progress of wickedness.

§ 17. The *Samaritans*, who worshipped on mount *Gerizim*, and lived in virulent hostility with their neighbors, the Jews, were equally oppressed; and were in an equal degree, the authors of their own calamities. It appears from the history of those times, that the Samaritans suffered as much as the Jews did, from the machinations of factious and unprincipled men; though, perhaps, they had fewer religious sects. That their religion was less pure than the Jewish, Christ himself testifies. John iv. 22. Yet they seem to have had more correct views of the offices of the Messiah, than the greater part of the Jews. John iv. 25. Though we are not to believe all that the Jews have said respecting their opinions, yet it is undeniable, that the Samaritans adulterated the pure doctrines of the Old Testament, with profane mixtures of pagan errors.(21)

§ 18. The narrow limits of Palestine, could not contain the very numerous nation of the Jews. Hence, when our Savior was born, there was almost no considerable province, which did not contain a large number of Jews, who lived by their traffic and by mechanic trades. These Jews, in the countries beyond Palestine, were protected against the violence and abuse of the in-

(20) See *Camp. Vitranga*, de Synagoga Vetere, L. III. c. v. and L. I. c. v, vii. [*Prideaux*, Connexions, &c. Pt. I. B. vi. anno 445. Tr.]

(21) The principal writers concerning the Samaritans, are enumerated by *J. G. Carpzov*, Critica Sacra Vet. Test. Pt. II. cap. vi. p. 595. [The most valuable are *Chr. Cellarius*, Hist. gentis Samarit. in his Diss. Acad. p. 109, &c. *Joh. Morin*, Antiq. eccles. orient. *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. II. Lib. II. c. 1—13. *H. Reland*, de Samaritanis, in his Diss. Miscell. Pt. II. (*H. Prideaux*, Connexions,) and *Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionspart. p. 274 &c. Schl.]

habitants, by public laws, and by the injunctions of the magistrates.(22) Yet they were, in most places, exceedingly odious to the mass of people, on account of their singularity as to religion and customs. The special providence of God, is undoubtedly to be recognized, in the dispersion of this people, (who were the depositaries of the true religion, or that which inculcates the worship of the one God,) over nearly the whole world; that they might, by their example, put superstition to shame, and might, in a manner, prepare the way for the christian religion.

(22) See *Ja. Gronovius*, *Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judæis, ad cultum divinum per Asiae Minoris urbes secure obeundum*. Lugd. Bat. 1712. 8vo. [For a candid and faithful account of the state of the Jews, both in Palestine and out of it, the English reader is referred to *Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel history*, Part I. vol. I. ch. ii—vi. Tr.]

CHAPTER III.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

§ 1. The birth of Christ.—§ 2. His childhood and youth.—§ 3. His precursor, John B.—§ 4. His subsequent life.—§ 5. He appoints twelve apostles, and seventy disciples.—§ 6. Reason of this number.—§ 7. Fame of Christ out of Judea.—§ 8. Success of his ministry.—§ 9. His death.—§ 10. His resurrection and ascension to heaven.

§ 1. So many and so virulent diseases of the human race, demanded the aid of a divine physician. Therefore the Son of God himself descended from heaven, upon Palestine, in the close of the reign of *Herod* the Great; and joining himself to human nature, he appeared to mortals, a teacher that could not err, and a sponsor at the court of heaven, as well as a king there. In what year, this salutary light rose upon the world, the most persevering efforts of the learned, have not been able fully to ascertain. Nor will this surprise us, if we consider that the earliest christians knew not the *day* of their Savior's birth, and judged differently on the subject.⁽¹⁾ But of what consequence is it,

(1) Most of the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of Christ's birth, are collected by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliographia Antiquar.* cap. vii. § ix. p. 187.—[Respecting the year of Christ's birth, the inquisitive reader is remitted to the elaborate Chronologists, *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *Usher*, &c. and to the more voluminous eccles. Historians, *Natalis Alexander*, *Pagi*, &c. But, not to leave the common reader wholly uninformed on the subject, a few general observations will here be made. The birth of Christ was first made an era, from which to reckon dates, by *Dionysius Exiguus*, about AD. 532. He supposed Christ to have been born, on the 25th December, in the year of Rome 753, *Lentulus* and *Piso* consuls. And this computation has been followed, in practice, to this day; notwithstanding the learned are well agreed, that it must be incorrect. To ascertain the true time of Christ's birth, there are *two principal data*, afforded by the Evangelists. I. It is clear, from *Matth. ii. 1*, &c. that Christ was born *before* the death of *Herod* the Great, who died about Easter, in the year of Rome 749 or 750. (*Lardner*, *Credibil.* Pt. I. vol. II. Appendix.) Now if Christ was born in the December next before *Herod's* death, it must have been in the year of Rome 748 or 749; and of course, four, if not five years anterior to the Dionysian or vulgar era. II. It is probable, from *Lu. iii. 1, 2, 23*, that Jesus was about thirty years of age, in the fifteenth year of the reign of *Tiberius Cæsar*. Now the reign of *Tiberius* may be considered as commencing at the time he became sole emperor, in August of the year of Rome 767; or, (as there is some reason to suppose, that *Augustus* made him partner in the government *two* years before he died,) we may begin his reign in the year of Rome 765. The 15th year of *Tiberius* will therefore be either the year of Rome 781, or 779. From which deduct 30, and we have the year of Rome 751 or 749, for the year of Christ's birth; the former *two*, and the latter *four* years *earlier* than the Dionysian computation.—Comparing these results with those obtained from the death of *Herod*, it is generally supposed, the true era of Christ's birth was the year of Rome 749, or four years before the vulgar era. But the conclusion is not certain, because there is uncertainty in the data. (1) It is not certain, that we ought to reckon *Tiberius'*

that we know not the year or day when this light first shone, since we fully know, that it *has* appeared, and that there is no obstacle to our enjoying its splendor and its warmth?

§ 2. An account of the birth, lineage, family, and parents of Christ, is left us by the four inspired writers who give the history of his life. But they say very little respecting his childhood and youth. When a young child he was rescued from the cruelty of Herod, by the flight into Egypt. Matt. ii. 13. When twelve years of age, he disputed publicly in the temple, with the most learned Jewish doctors, upon religious subjects. Afterwards till he was thirty years of age, he lived with his parents, as a dutiful and affectionate son. Lu. ii. 51, 52. Divine wisdom has not seen fit to give us more particulars; nor is it certain,—though many think it so,—that Christ worked at the trade of his foster-father *Joseph*, who was a carpenter. Yet there were anciently some vain and deceitful persons, who ventured to fill up this obscure part of our Savior's life, with extravagant and ridiculous fables.(2)

§ 3. In the thirtieth year of his age, he entered on the offices for which he came into the world. To render his ministry more useful to the Jews, *John*, the son of a Jewish priest, a man grave and venerable in his whole manner of life, was commissioned of God, to proclaim the advent of the *Messiah* promised to the fathers. He called himself the *precursor* of the *Messiah*; and being full of holy zeal, exhorted the Jews to amend their lives, and purify their hearts, and so prepare for the coming, or rather for the actual presence, of the Son of God; and those who professed repentance and reformation, he initiated into, [or, showed to be waiting for,] the approaching kingdom of the Savior, by immersion in the Jordan. Matt. iii, 2 &c. Joh. i. 22 &c. *Jesus* himself, before commencing his public ministry, chose to receive a solemn lustration in the waters of Jordan, at the hands of *John*: that he might not appear to neglect any part of the Jewish law and religion.(3)

reign as beginning two years before the death of Augustus. (2) Luke says "about thirty years of age." This is indefinite, and may be understood of 29, 30 or 31 years. (3) It is not certain, in which of the two years mentioned, Herod died; nor *how long* before that event, the Savior was born. Respecting the *month* and *day* of Christ's birth, we are left almost wholly to conjecture. The disagreement of the early fathers, is evidence, that the day was not celebrated as a festival in the apostolic times. Tr.]

(2) See a collection of these fables by *J. A. Fabricius*, Codex Apocryphus N. Test. tom. I. [The works here referred to, are the Gospel of the nativity of Mary: the Previous Gospel, ascribed to *James the Just*: The Gospel of the infancy of Christ, ascribed to *Thomas*: The Gospel of the infancy &c. translated from the Arabic; all of which are stuffed with marvellous tales of miracles and prodigies, fit only to amuse the ignorant and superstitious Tr.]

(3) [See, concerning John the Baptist, *Chr. Cellarius*, two Diss. de Vita; cat-
VOL. I.

§ 4. It is not necessary to enter here into a particular detail of the life and actions of *Jesus Christ*. All christians know, that for more than three years, amidst great trials and afflictions, and surrounded by snares and perils, he instructed the Jewish people in the counsels and purposes of the Most High; that he omitted nothing that could allure both the ignorant multitude, and the well informed; that he led a life so spotless and holy, that no suspicion whatever could attach to him; and that, by stupendous miracles, of a salutary and beneficial character, and such as accorded with the nature of his mission, he placed the truth of the religion he taught, beyond all controversy.

§ 5. As this religion was to be propagated throughout the world, it was necessary for him to select some persons to be his constant companions and intimates; who should be able to state and testify to posterity, and to the remotest nations, with the greatest assurance and authority, the events of his life, his miracles, and his whole system of doctrine. Therefore, from the Jews about him, he chose twelve messengers, whom he distinguished from the rest by the title of *Apostles*. They were plebians, poor, and illiterate; for he would not employ the rich, the eloquent, and the learned; lest the success of their mission should be ascribed to natural causes, and to human means. 1 Cor. i. 21. These he once sent forth among the Jews, during his lifetime; Matt. x. 7. but afterwards, he retained them constantly near him; that they might witness all that he said or did.(4) But, that the people might not lack religious instruction, he commissioned seventy other disciples, to travel at large through Judea. Lu. x. 1.

§ 6. The learned have enquired why the Savior appointed just *twelve*, neither more nor less, to be apostles; and *seventy* to be his disciples; and various conjectures are offered on the subject.

cere et supplicio Jo. Bapt. in his Diss. Acad. Pt. I. p. 169. and Pt. II. p. 373. *Tho. Ittig*, *Historiæ eccles. Imi. Sæculi Selecta Capita*, cap. 8. sect. 4. and *Witsius*, *Miscell. Sacra*, tom II. p. 464 &c. *Schl.*—also *G. B. Winer*, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, Article *Johannes*. Tr.]

(4) Dr. *Mosheim* has a long note in the parallel passage of his *Comment. de Rebus Chr. ante C. M.* p. 49. the substance of which is this. The title *Apostles* was given to those principal men, whom the high priests retained as their private counsellors; and whom they occasionally sent as their legates, to the foreign Jews; either to collect the yearly tax for the temple, or to execute other commissions. We have not indeed, a direct testimony at hand, proving that the title of *apostles* was given to such legates of the high priests in the days of Christ. Yet there is intimation of this in Gal i. 1. and *Jerome* so understood the passage. See his *Commentt.* &c. *Opp.* tom. IX. p. 124. And that after the destruction of Jerusalem, the legates of the Jewish *Patriarchs*, (who stood in the place of high priests,) were called apostles, is fully proved. See *Jerome*, ubi supra, and *Eusebius* on Isa. Ch. xviii. 2. See also *Ja. Godefroi* on Cod. Theodos. tom. VI. p. 251 ed. Ritter. *Dion. Petavius*, on Epiphan. ad Hæres. xxx. *P. Weseling*, de Archontibus Jud. p. 91. *Walch*, (of Gotting.) Hist. Patriarch. Jud. and *Suicer*, *Thesaur. Eccles.* tom. I. p. 477. Tr.]

But as it is manifest from the words of *Christ* himself, Matt. xix. 28. Lu. xxii. 30. that the number of the apostles had reference to the number of the tribes of Israel, there can scarcely be a doubt that he wished to indicate to the Jews, that he was the supreme Lord and Pontiff over the whole Hebrew race, which was divided into twelve tribes. The seventy disciples were just equal in number to the senators, composing the Sanhedrim, or grand council of the nation : and this justifies the conjecture, that *Christ* intended, by the choice of the *seventy*, to admonish the Jews that the authority of their Sanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power in relation to religious matters, was vested in him alone.(5)

§ 7. Jesus himself gave instruction to none but Jews ; nor did he allow his disciples to travel among other nations, as teachers, while he continued on earth. Matt x. 5, 6. xv. 24. Yet the extraordinary deeds performed by him, leave no room to doubt that his fame, very early, extended to other nations. There are respectable writers, who state that *Abgarus*, king of Edessa, being dangerously sick, sent a letter to *Christ*, imploring his assistance ; and that he not only wrote an answer to the king, but also sent him his picture.(6) It is the prevailing opinion, that not only the letters of *Christ* and *Abgarus*, but likewise the whole story, were a fabrication.(7) I would by no means take upon me to support the credit of the letters ; but I see no very weighty reason for rejecting altogether, the whole story.

§ 8. No small part of the Jewish people were excited by the demonstrations of divine authority in *Christ*, to revere him as the Son of God : but the leading men, especially the Pharisees and

(5) [There are two factitious lists of the seventy disciples now extant ; which are falsely ascribed to *Hippolytus*, and to *Doritheus*. They may be seen in various works ; e. g. *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang. &c. p. 115—118. and annexed to the books de Vita and morte Mosis, ed. Fabricius ; and in *T. Ittig*, Hist. eccles. Imi Saecul. p. 472. That no sort of credit is due to them, is shown by *Ittig*. ubi supra ; by *D. Blondell*, de Episcopis et Presbyt. p. 93. and by others. *Eusebius* Hist. Eccles. I. 12. expressly declares, that no catalogue of the seventy disciples was to be found any where, in his day. The two lists nearly agree ; and are evidently made up by collecting together, without the least judgment, nearly all the names of christians mentioned in the N. Testament, and particularly in the salutations of Paul. Tr.]

(6) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. I. c. 18. [Here is the earliest notice of these Letters. For the earliest history of the picture, see *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. L. IV. c. 27. See the Letters themselves, with notes, in] *J. A. Fabricius*, Codex Apocryphus N. T. tom. I. p. 317.

(7) See *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. I. c. 18. p. 500. *Theoph. Sigf. Bayer*, Historia Edessena et Osroëna, L. III. p. 104. *J. S. Asseman*, Biblioth. orient. Clem. Vat. tom. I. p. 554. [“ As to the picture, which is still preserved, and shown at Rome,—*Is. Beausobre* has fully exposed the fable, in his Dis. des Images de main divine ; in the Biblioth. Germanique. tom. XVIII. p. 10. &c.” *Mosheim* de Rebus Chr. &c. p. 73.]

the chief priests, whose vices and crimes he freely reprov'd, plotted against his life ; being fearful of losing their honors and privileges, if *Christ* should continue publicly to preach. For a long time the machinations of these ungodly men were ineffectual. But at last, his ungrateful disciple, *Judas*, disclosing the place of his master's nocturnal retirement, he was seized by soldiers, at the command of the Sanhedrim, and ordered to be tried for his life.

§ 9. He was first arraigned before the Jewish high priest and senate, where he was accused of having violated the law, and blasphemed the majesty of God. Thence he was dragged to the tribunal of *Pilate*, the Roman procurator ; and there accused of sedition, and of treason against Cæsar. Neither of these accusations could have satisfied fair and upright judges. But the clamors of the people, which were instigated by the irreligious priests, compelled *Pilate*, though reluctantly, to pass sentence of death upon him. He, as he had come into our world to make expiation for the sins of men, and knew that all the objects of his abode among them were accomplished, voluntarily submitted to be nailed to a cross, on which he yielded up his spotless soul to God.

§ 10. On the third day after his burial, he reassumed life, which he had voluntarily laid down ; and showing himself alive, he made it manifest, that man is no longer insolvent to divine justice. He now continued forty days with his disciples, employing the time very much in giving them instruction. To his enemies he would not appear visibly ; among other reasons, one was, that he knew those unprincipled men who had before accused him of sorcery, would impudently affirm, that only a spectre appeared, bearing his likeness, and produced by the power of the devil. At length, in the presence of his disciples, he ascended up to heaven, after commissioning them to preach the Gospel to all nations.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Effusion of the H. Spirit on the apostles.—§ 2. They preach to Jews and Samaritans.—§ 3. Election of a new apostle.—§ 4. Paul's conversion.—§ 5. Attention to the poor, and a community of goods, in the church.—§ 6. Many churches planted by the apostles.—§ 7. Respect for Christ among the pagans. § 8. Causes of the rapid progress of christianity.—§ 9. Extraordinary gifts of the early christians.—§ 10. Fictitious causes assigned for the progress of christianity.

§ 1. When *Jesus* was seated at the right hand of the eternal Father, the first proof he gave of his majesty and power, was on the fiftieth day⁽¹⁾ after his death, by the effusion of the Holy Spirit, upon his disciples and friends on earth. Acts ii. 1 &c. On receiving this celestial gift and teacher, they were freed from all their former ignorance and blindness of mind, and endued with astonishing alacrity and power to fulfil the duties of their office. With these mental endowments, was joined the knowledge of various foreign languages; which was indispensable to them, in giving instruction to different nations; and also a firm reliance on the promise of *Christ*, that God would aid them as often as should be necessary, by miracles.⁽²⁾

§ 2. Relying on this divine assistance, the disciples in accordance with the Savior's injunctions, (Lu. xxiv. 47. Acts i. 8. xiii. 46.) first labored to convert the Jews to *Christ*. Nor was this labor without effect, for many thousands of them soon became christians. Acts ii. 41. iv. 4. Next they proceeded to the Samaritans, which also their commission required. Acts i. 8. And here too, they gathered a christian church. Acts viii. 14. Lastly, after spending many years at Jerusalem, and regulating and confirming the churches of Christ in Palestine and the neighboring regions, they travelled abroad among various nations, their labors being every where attended with the greatest success.⁽³⁾

(1) [From the terms here used by Dr. *Mosheim*, it would seem that he supposed the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, took place on the Jewish sabbath, or *Saturday*; and not on *Sunday*, as many have supposed. *Tr.*]

(2) [In his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 76, Dr. *Mosheim* states, that he does not account the *power of working miracles* among the supernatural gifts; because such power neither was, nor could be, conferred on men, omnipotence alone being able to work miracles; so that, *faith* to pray for them, and to expect them, at the hands of God, was all that the H. Ghost actually imparted to the apostles. *Tr.*]

(3) [It appears from the book of *Acts*, that the apostles, or at least most of them, remained in and near Jerusalem, for several years after the ascension; but

§ 3. The first care of the apostles after the Savior's ascension was, to complete the number of twelve apostles established by *Christ*, by electing a more worthy person to the place of Judas, who had laid violent hands on himself. Therefore, the little company of *Christ's* servants at Jerusalem being assembled, two men, the most noted for their piety and faith in *Christ*, *Barnabas* and *Matthias* were proposed, as the most worthy of that office. One of these, *Matthias*, being designated by lot, as it is commonly supposed, or elected by the major vote of all the persons present, was constituted the twelfth apostle. Acts i. 15, &c.(4)

§ 4. As these twelve ambassadors of *Christ* were, all of them, plain, illiterate men; and as the christian community, now in its infancy, needed a man who could attack and vanquish the Jewish doctors and the pagan philosophers, with their own weapons; *Jesus Christ* himself, a little after the appointment of *Matthias*, by a voice from heaven, created a thirteenth apostle; namely, *Saul*, who afterwards assumed the name of *Paul*; a man who had been a most virulent enemy of the christians, but who was well skilled in the Jewish learning, and not ignorant of the Grecian. Acts ix. 1, &c. To this truly admirable man, whether we consider his courage, his force of mind, or his patience and perseverance in trials and labors, how much the christian world is indebted, is manifest from the *Acts of the Apostles*, and his own *Epistles*.

§ 5. The first of all the christian churches founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem: and after the form and model of this, all the others of that age, were constituted. That church, however, was governed immediately by the apostles; to whom the *presbyters*, and the overseers of the poor, or the *deacons*, were subject. Though the people had not withdrawn themselves from the Jewish worship, yet they held their own separate meetings; in which they received instruction from the apostles and presbyters; offered up united prayers; celebrated, in the sacred supper, the memorial of *Jesus Christ*, of his death, and the salvation he procured; and then, manifested their mutual love, partly by their liberality to the poor, and partly by those temperate repasts, which from their design were called *love-feasts*. Acts ii.

how long they continued together is uncertain. There was anciently a tradition, which *Eusebius* states, (Hist. Eccles. v. 18.) on the authority of *Apollonius*, a writer of the second century, as does *Clemens Alex.* (Strom. vi. c. 5.) from a spurious work, *Prædicatio Petri*,—that the Savior enjoined upon his apostles, not to leave Jerusalem, till *twelve years* after his ascension. About so long they probably continued there: and their being divinely guided, in most of their movements, might give rise to the tradition. Tr.]

(4) [Dr. Mosheim has a long note in the parallel place in his Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 78—80, in which he aims to prove, that ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν, in Acts i. 26. signifies *they gave their votes*; and not, as it is commonly understood, *they cast their lots*. But his interpretation is very generally rejected. Tr.]

42.(5) Among the virtues, for which this primitive church of Christ was distinguished, their care of the poor and needy, is most conspicuous. For the rich liberally supplied the wants of all the brotherhood; and with such promptitude and tenderness, that *Luke* says, *they had all things common*. Acts ii. 44. iv. 32. But it is clear, from the expressions used by *Peter*, in Acts v. 4. as well as from other considerations, that the declaration of *Luke* should not be understood, as it generally has been, of their *possessing* in common, but only of their *using* in common.(6)

§ 6. The ambassadors of Christ, leaving Jerusalem, travelled over a great part of the world; and in a short time, collected numerous religious societies in various countries. Of churches founded by them, not a small number is mentioned in the sacred books, especially in the *Acts* of the Apostles.(7) Besides these, there can be no doubt, they collected many others; both by their own efforts, and by the efforts of their followers. But, how far they travelled, what nations they visited, or when and where they died, is exceedingly dubious and uncertain.(8) The stories of-

(5) Dr. Mosheim understood Acts ii. 42. as descriptive of the several parts of the *ordinary public worship* of these primitive christians, rather than of their *christian character and conduct* in general. See his Comment. de Rebus Christianorum ante C. Mag. 113—116. If Mosheim's interpretation of that *text* is erroneous, as most interpreters think it is, this account of the mode of worship in the apostolic church, rests on a slender basis. Tr.]

(6) ["It is an ancient opinion, though not older than the fourth century, that in the church of Jerusalem there was such a *community of goods*, as existed among the ancient Essenes and now among monks. But this opinion is destitute of any solid foundation; resting solely on the declaration of *Luke*, that they had all things common. See my Diss. de Vera natura communionis bonorum in Ecclesia Hierosolym. which is the first, in the second volume of my Dissertt. ad Historiam Eccl. pertinentes." Mosheim, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 118.]

(7) The names of these churches are collected, by *P. J. Hartmann*, de Rebus gestis Christianor, sub Apostolis, cap. vii. p. 107; and by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorients, cap. v. p. 83, &c.

(8) [It is a very ancient and current report, confirmed by many witnesses, that all the apostles suffered public martyrdom; with the exception of St. John, who died a natural death at Ephesus. And this opinion is so firmly believed, by many who would not be thought credulous, that to call it in question, is to run some hazard of being charged with slandering those holy men. Such as please, may believe the account; but let them not be offended, if I declare the martyrdom of most of the apostles, to be less certain than they suppose. That *Peter*, *Paul* and *James* died violent deaths, I believe, on the testimony of the numerous ancient authors; but that the other apostles did so, I cannot feel so certain. As my first ground of doubt, a very ancient writer of the second century, *Heracleon*, a Valentinian indeed, but no contemptible man, cited by *Clemens. Alex. Strom. L. iv. c. 9.* denies that *Matthew*, *Philip*, *Thomas*, *Levi*, and others, confessed Christ before magistrates, and were put to death for so doing. He is urging, that the public confession of himself required by the Savior, Matt. x. 32. may be made by a holy and christian life, as well as by a public avowal before a persecuting magistrate; and he states as proof, 'Ου γὰρ πάντες οἱ σωζόμενοι ὡμολόγησαν τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὡμολογίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθον. 'Εξ ὧν Ματθαῖος, Φίλιππος, Λευῖς, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, for not all that were saved, made that confession in words (before magistrates) and so died. Of this number was *Matthew*, *Philip*,

ten told, respecting their travels among the Gauls, the Britons, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too recent and fantastic, to be received by an inquisitive lover of the truth.(9) A great part of

Thomas, Leri and many others. *Clement*, though he disapproves several things in the passage he quotes, leaves this statement to stand as it is ; which is proof that he had nothing to allege against it.—*Philip* is expressly declared, not to have suffered martyrdom, but to have died and been buried at Hierapolis ; so says *Polycrates*. in his Epistle to Victor, in *Eusebius*. Hist. Eccl. v. 24. *Baronius* indeed, (Annals. AD. 35. § 141.) and after him many others maintain, that this was not *Philip the apostle*, but Philip, one of the seven deacons of Jerusalem. But *Polycrates* says expressly, that he was *one of the twelve apostles*.—A still stronger argument is, that all the writers of the three first centuries, and among them, such as contended for the high dignity of the martyrs, in opposition to the Valentinians, viz. *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alex.* and *Origen*, never mention but *three* of the apostles as being *martyrs* ; namely, *Peter*, *Paul* and *James* the elder. See *Tertullian*, Scorpiace cap. xv.—I am therefore led to believe, that the common reports respecting the sufferings of Christ's ambassadors were fabricated, after the days of Constantine. And two causes might lead to such reports. (1) The extravagant estimation in which martyrdom was held, made it seem necessary to rank the apostles among the martyrs.—(2) The ambiguity of the word *μάρτυρ*, *martyr*, which properly signifies *a witness*, in which sense Christ himself called his apostles *μάρτυρες*, (Acts i. 8. see also Acts ii. 32.) might lead the more ignorant to believe, and to amplify these fables. *Mosheim*. de Rebu Christ. ante C. M. p. 81—84. abridged considerably. Tr.]

(9) [" There is *not one* of the European nations that does not glory, in either an apostle, or some one of the seventy disciples, or at least in some early saint commissioned by an apostle, as having come among them and collected a christian church. The *Spaniards* say, that the apostles *Paul* and *James* the elder, with many of the seventy disciples, and other assistants of the apostles, introduced the light of the gospel into *their* country. And a Spaniard would bring himself into trouble if he should confront this opinion. The *French* contend that *Crescens*, a disciple and companion of *Paul*, *Dionysius*, the Athenian Areopagite, *Lazarus*, *Mary Magdalene*, &c. first brought *their* countrymen to profess Christ. Among the *Italians* there is scarcely a city, which does not profess to have received the gospel, and its first minister from *Paul* or *Peter*. See *P. Gian-none*, Histoire civile du royaume de Naples. tom. I. p. 74, 75. And, at this day, a man could not escape the charge of heresy, who should raise a question on this subject. See *J. Lamy*, Deliciæ eruditorum, tom. viii. Pref. and tom. xi. Preface. The *Germans* assert that *Maternus*, *Valerianus*, and many others were sent among *them* by the apostles ; and that these legates of St. Peter, and of the other apostles, baptised respectable numbers of persons. The *British* think that St. *Paul*, (as they infer from *Clemens Rom.* first Epistle to the Corinthians,) *Simon Zelotes*, *Aristobulus*, and especially *Joseph* of Arimathea, were the founders of *their* church. The *Russians*, *Poles* and *Prussians*, honor St. *Andrew* as the founder of *their* churches. All this, and much more, passed for sober truth, so long as sacred and human learning lay buried in shades and darkness. But at this day, the most learned and wise admit, that most of these stories were fabricated after the age of Charlemagne, by men unlearned, or crafty and eager to secure distinction to their churches. See *Aug. Calmet's* Histoire de Lorraine, tom. I. p. xxvi. *Le Beuf*, Diss. sur l'histoire de France, tom. I. p. 192 &c. *Jo. Launoï*, Diss. qua locus Sulpitii Severi de primis Galliæ martyribus defenditur, Opp. tom. II. Pt. I. p. 184.—I commend these writers ; yet cannot agree with them in dating the commencement of this foolish zeal for the antiquity of their churches, *after* the days of Charlemagne. It began much earlier. See *Gregory Thron.* de Gloria martyrum, cap. xii. p. 735." *Mosheim* de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 84—86. It must not be inferred from what Dr. Mosheim says of the foolish pretensions of the modern European nations to a high christian antiquity, that

these fabulous stories were got up, after the days of *Charlemagne*; when most of the christian churches contended as vehemently, about the antiquity of their origin, as ever the Arcadians, Egyptians, and Greeks did.

§ 7. Many who were unwilling to adopt entirely the religion of Christ, were induced nevertheless, by the fame of his deeds, and the sublime purity of his doctrines, to rank him among men of the highest excellence, and even among the gods; as numerous documents evince. With great veneration, many preserved pictures of Christ in their houses; and also the pictures of his apostles.(10) It is said that a Roman emperor, *Tiberius*, proposed to have *Christ* enrolled among the gods of the empire; but that the senate rejected the proposal. Though many at the present day,

we are to reject *all* that the ancient fathers relate, concerning the labors of the apostles after Christ's ascension. Dr. *Mosheim* was too judicious to do this. He says, *ubi supra*. p. 80, 81: "As to what we are told respecting the transactions of the apostles, their travels, miracles and deaths, if we except what is gathered from the New Test. and a few other ancient monuments, a large part is dubious and uncertain. Some things however have more credibility, and verisimilitude, than others. I would not reject *all* that is clearly attested by *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Paulinus*, *Jerome*, *Socrates*, and some more ancient writers quoted by *Eusebius*; but what is attested only by authors subsequent to these, or unknown, I would not readily believe, unless facts offer themselves to corroborate the testimony."—Following these judicious rules of *Mosheim*, we may believe that *Peter*, after preaching long in Judea, and other parts of Syria, probably visited Babylon, Asia Minor, and finally Rome, where he was crucified.—*Paul's* history is given in the Acts to about AD. 64. He was probably released from captivity, visited Judea, Asia Minor and Greece, and returning to Rome, was there beheaded about AD. 67 or 68. *John* remained many years in Judea, and afterwards removed to Ephesus, where he lived to a very advanced age, dying about AD. 100. He was banished to Patmos about AD. 95, and was greatly revered. *James* the elder, (brother of John,) was put to death by Herod Agrippa, about AD. 44. (Acts xii. 1.)—*James* the younger, the son of Alphaeus, spent his life in Judea, long presided over the church of Jerusalem, and there suffered martyrdom, a little before the destruction of Jerusalem. *Andrew*, probably labored on the shores of the black sea, near the modern Constantinople, and perhaps in Greece. *Philip*, either the apostle or the evangelist, is reported to have ended his days at Hierapolis, in Phrygia. *Thomas* seems to have travelled eastward, to Parthia, Media, Persia and India. *Bartholomew*, took perhaps, a more southern course, and preached in Arabia. *Matthew* is also reported to have travelled east, in the modern Persia. Of *Simon* the Canaanite, nothing to be relied on can be said. *Thaddeus*, *Lebbeus*, or *Jude* the brother of James, the author of an epistle, is reported to have preached at Edessa, in the north of Syria. Of the companions of the apostles, *Timothy*, after accompanying Paul many years, is said to have been stationed at Ephesus, where he suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Nerva. *Titus*, another companion of Paul, is reported to have been stationed in Crete, where he died. *Mark*, or *John* surnamed Mark, attended Paul, and afterwards Peter, and probably preached the gospel in Egypt. Of *Luke*, little can be said, except that he accompanied Paul, and wrote his history, viz. the book of Acts, and a Gospel. Of *Barnabas*, nothing can be said worth relating, except what is learned from the N. Testament. See *J. A. Fabricius*, *Lux Evangelii*. &c. ch. v. p. 95—115.—From this account, imperfect as it is, we may conclude that the apostles and their companions scarcely extended their labors beyond the boundaries of the present Turkish empire. *Tr.*]

(10) *Eusebius*, *Historia eccles.* L. vii. c. 18. *Irenæus*, *Hæres.* Lib. i. c. 25. p. 105. edit. Massuet.

think this to be improbable, yet there are distinguished men who are led by weighty reasons, to a different opinion.(11)

§ 8. The causes must have been divine, which enabled men destitute of all human aid, poor, friendless, neither eloquent nor learned, fishermen, publicans, and moreover Jews, that is, persons odious to all other nations; in so short a time, to persuade a great part of mankind to abandon the religions of their fathers, and to embrace a new religion, which is opposed to the natural dispositions of men. In their speeches, there was an amazing and a divine power of controlling the minds of men. To which may be added, miracles, prophecies, the detection of men's secret designs, magnanimity in the midst of perils, contempt for all the objects of ordinary ambition, a patient, cheerful endurance of sufferings worse than death, as well as of death itself, and finally, lives of the purest and most unblemished character. That the ambassadors of Jesus Christ *were* thus furnished for their work, is a truth perfectly clear and obvious. And if these holy men had not been so furnished, no probable reason could be offered for this rapid propagation of christianity by the little feeble band.

(11) ["Of the favorable disposition of the Roman emperors towards christianity, there is a noticeable testimony in the Apology of *Melito Sardicensis*, addressed to Marcus Antoninus, which is preserved by *Eusebius*. Hist. Eccl. iv. 26. Melito here informs the emperor that his predecessors not only tolerated christianity among the other religions, but also honored it: *ἡν καὶ οἱ προγονοὶ σοῦ πρὸς ἄλλαις θρησκείαις ἐτίμησαν*, which sect your progenitors treated with equal respect as the other religions. He adds, that *Nero* and *Domitian* were the *only* emperors who allowed the counsels of certain adversaries, to influence them to make christianity a criminal thing. If what Melito here says of Nero be true, namely, that he was influenced by the counsels of malevolent persons, to persecute the christians, then there may be some foundation for what *John* of Antioch says, in *Excerptis Valesianis*, p. 808 &c. that Nero was favorable to the christians, and to Christ, in the beginning of his reign.—*Tertullian*, Apologet. cap. v. p. 57. ed. Havercamp. speaks of *Tiberius'* desire to have Christ enrolled among the gods, as of a thing universally known. *Eusebius*, (Hist. Eccles. ii. 2.) *Orosius*, (Chron. Pascal. vii. 4.) and others afterwards, repeat the story, relying chiefly on the authority of *Tertullian*. See *Fr. Baldwin*, Comment. ad. edicta Veterum Principum Romanorum de Christianis, p. 22, 23, and *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii &c. p. 221. But very learned men in this age, have deemed this wholly incredible, and not at all compatible with the character of *Tiberius*, and with the state of the empire, at that time. In what manner, men equally learned and ingenious, have repelled their arguments, may be seen in the Essay of *Theod. Hasæus*, de decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum deorum, Erfurt. 1715. 4to. and in the French letter of *J. C. Iselius*, on this subject, in the *Bibliothèque Germanique* tom. xxxii. p. 147. and tom. xxxiii. p. 12."—*Mosheim* de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 91. &c.—See also *Altmann*, Disquisitio historico-critica, de Epistola Pilati ad Tiberium &c. Bern 1755. 8vo. In this essay, Professor *Altmann* maintains, (1) That Pilate was actually informed of the resurrection of Christ, by the guard. (2) That he did really send to *Tiberius*, an account of the death and resurrection of Jesus, though not such an account as the one now extant. (3) That *Tiberius* actually proposed in the senate that Jesus should be honored as a god. This subject is also examined by Dr. *Lardner*, Collection of Jewish and Heathen testimonies, vol. III. p. 599 &c. ed. Lond. 1715. 4to. Tr.]

§ 9. To all this must be added, the ability which these ambassadors of God possessed, of transferring the power of working miracles to their disciples. Many, as soon as they were baptized according to Christ's directions, and consecrated to God by prayer and the imposition of hands, were able, immediately to express their thoughts in foreign languages which they had never learned, to foretell future events, to heal the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, to call the dead to life, and to perform other deeds above the power of man.(12) What must have been thought of the men who had ability to confer such wonderful powers on others!

§ 10. Those who pretend to assign other causes for this surprising revolution in the religious state of the world, recite fictions which will never satisfy an attentive observer of human affairs. Some conjecture that the kindness of christians to the poor, induced a multitude of idle and vicious persons to embrace christianity. But they forget that such as embraced this religion, exposed their lives to imminent danger; nor do they reflect, that vicious, lazy persons, who would not work, were not tolerated among christians. [2 Thess. iii. 6—12.] Equally groundless is the representation of others, that the profligate and flagitious lives of the pagan priests caused many to turn christians. But the vile character of these priests, though it might bring the ancient systems of religion into contempt, could not produce attachment to christianity, which exposed its votaries to the loss of property, character and life. The man must be beside himself who could reason thus: "The priests of the religion in which I was educated lead profligate lives; I therefore will join myself with those who are universally despised, and by the public laws condemned, and thus put my life and fortune to the most imminent hazard."(13)

(12) See, among others, *Tob. Pfanner, de Charismatis, sive donis miraculosis antiquæ ecclesiæ*, Francf. 1683. 12mo.

(13) ["Others have supposed, that the virtues of the apostles and their early followers,—their sobriety, their contempt of wealth, their fortitude, their patience &c. induced multitudes to put themselves under their religious guidance. Integrity and virtue, certainly have influence on the mind of the beholder; nor would I deny, that the holy lives of the apostles produced some effect. But we know, if we are acquainted with ourselves, and with human nature, that purity of morals, and integrity of life, though they create respect and reverence, rarely produce imitation, and never, if manifest disgrace and danger will follow that imitation. We know, that virtue, and even the most perfect virtue, awakens entire disgust; when it requires men to forsake the institutions and sentiments of their ancestors, and to abandon their chosen enjoyments. This is confirmed by the example of those very apostles who are said to have converted the world by the purity of their characters; nay, by the example of the Lord of those apostles, who was the most perfect pattern of virtue. I can believe that the blameless lives of the apostles induced individuals among all nations, not to lay violent hands on them, or to show them any abuse; but to believe that they, merely by their strict morals, and their disregard for the common objects of human at-

tachment, induced many thousands to recognize as the Savior of the world, a person whom the Jews had caused to be crucified; to follow their own example, and to suffer death, rather than renounce these principles; this, I say, no one can persuade me to believe. And, not to protract these remarks, whence and by what means, did the apostles themselves acquire that admirable virtue and sanctity, which alone was able to produce in others an invincible determination to fly to Christ, and to cleave to him as the only anchor of their salvation?"—

"Others, following the example of *Celsus, Julian, Porphyry*, and other ancient enemies of christianity, bid us consider, that the churches gathered by the apostles, were composed of plebeian characters; servants, laborers in the fields and workshops, and women; that is, of persons deficient in intelligence, rank, and wealth, who might easily be persuaded to believe almost any thing, by persons of but moderate talents. But this, which is here so confidently asserted, in the first place, was not altogether true. For the scriptures inform us that, among those converted to christianity by the apostles, many were affluent, well-informed, and of respectable rank. That there were persons of wealth, see 1 Tim. ii. 9. and 1 Peter iii. 3. That there were men of learning and knowledge of philosophy, see 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8. And that there were *some*, though *not many*, noble, see 1 Cor. i. 26. The names of illustrious persons who embraced Christ in the earliest ages of the church are collected by *D. Blondell*, de *Episcopis et presbyteris*, p. 235. and by *J. R. Wetstein*, *Præfatio ad Originis Dial. contra Marcion*, p. 13.—Secondly, those who are not ignorant of the world, know that persons in the lower walks of life, not only value themselves, their lives, and their enjoyments, as much as others do; but they much more ardently embrace, and cling to the customs, opinions and religion of their ancestors, than men of genius and influence, the opulent, and persons of rank.—Ignorance and timidity produce, and nourish, superstition. Hence the more ignorant and timid a person is, a stronger hold has superstition of his mind. So that, it is an easier thing to eradicate superstition from the minds of ten men, than of one woman, from a hundred well informed and ingenuous minds, than from ten ignorant, stupid ones. Villany no where reigns more, than in servants and persons of abject condition. It would be easier, therefore, to purge from iniquity a multitude of the ingenuous and well born, than even a small number of slaves. Hence, those who make the churches gathered by the apostles of Christ, to have been composed of persons of no respectability, or rank, of slaves, women, and the illiterate, in my judgment, increase, rather than diminish the glory achieved by those inspired men." *Mosheim*, de *Reb. Christ.* p. 90—92.]

CHAPTER V.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Persecutions of the christians by Jews in Palestine.—§ 2. By Jews out of Palestine.—§ 3. Divine judgments on the Jews.—§ 4. Ten persecutions by the pagans.—§ 5. Laws against the christians.—§ 6. Causes of hostility to them. Charged with hatred to mankind.—§ 7. Other causes of persecution.—§ 8. Slanders against christians.—§ 9. Modes of trial and punishment.—§ 10. The martyrs and confessors.—§ 11. Number of them.—§ 12. Acts of the martyrs.—§ 13. Persecution by Nero.—§ 14. Its extent.—§ 15. Persecution under Domitian.

§ 1. Though the disciples of *Christ* were distinguished for the excellence of their doctrines and the purity of their lives, yet the Jewish priests and rulers not only treated them with extreme contumely and abuse, but put to death as many of them as they could. This appears from the martyrdom of *Stephen*, Acts vii. 55. of *James* the son of *Zebedee*. Acts xii. 1, 2, and of *James* the *Just*, who presided over the church of Jerusalem. *Josephus*, Antiq. Jud. L. xx. c. 8. and *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. II. c. 23. The true cause of this hostility of the Jewish priests and doctors, undoubtedly was their envy, and their fear of losing their personal advantages and their consequence, if christianity prevailed.

§ 2. No less cruelty was shewn to the innocent disciples of *Christ*, by those Jews who lived out of Palestine, in the Roman provinces. It appears from the Acts of the apostles, and from other credible records, that they spared no pains to instigate the magistrates and the populace to destroy the christians. To this madness, they were excited by the high priest and the elders of the Jews, living in Palestine : who, as we are informed, sent messengers to the foreign Jews, exhorting them to avoid all connexion with the christians, and to persecute them as far as was in their power.(1) To cloke this base procedure under an honorable garb, they gave out that the christians had treasonable designs against the Roman government ; that they acknowledged as their king, one *Jesus*, a malefactor, whom *Pilate* had most justly punished with death. This rage against the christians was propagated from father to son, through successive generations ; so that the church in after ages had no more bitter enemies than the Jews.(2)

(1) See *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 51—53, 109, 138, 318. ed. Jebbs.

(2) [Passages from early christian writers, who complain of the *Jewish* persecutions, are collected by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang. toti orbi exorients, ch. vi. § 1. p. 121. See also the Epist. of the church of Smyrna, de Martyrio Polycarpi, § xii. xiii. Schl.]

§ 3. But God himself visited this perfidious nation with the sorest judgments, on account of their cruelties to the Savior and his friends. For he suffered Jerusalem, the capital of Palestine, together with the temple, to be rased to their foundation by the Roman emperor *Vespasian* and his son *Titus*, about forty years after *Christ's* ascension; and an innumerable multitude of the people to perish by the sword, and most of the survivors to be sold into slavery. A more distressing scene than this,—which is described at large by *Josephus*,⁽³⁾ himself a Jew,—is perhaps, no where to be found in the records of history. And from this time onward, the Jews have been every where even more than before, objects of hatred and abhorrence to all nations.

§ 4. The gentiles who were polytheists, brought upon the christian church, still greater calamities, than the Jews *could* do, whose power was not equal to their malice. The persecutions of the christians by the Romans, have, for many ages, been accounted *ten* in number.⁽⁴⁾ But the ancient history of the church, does not support precisely this number: for if we reckon only the general and more severe persecutions, they were fewer than ten; but if we include the provincial and more limited persecutions, the number will be much greater than ten. Some christians of the fifth century were led by certain passages of the scripture, especially by one in the Apocalypse, ch. xvii. 12—14. to believe that it was decreed, the christian church must pass through *ten* grievous persecutions; and to this opinion, they afterwards endeavored to accommodate in different ways the dissenting language of history.⁽⁵⁾

§ 5. *Nero* first enacted laws for the extermination of christians. *Domitian* next did the same; and afterwards *Marcus Antoninus*, the philosopher, *Severus*, and the other emperors who were hostile to the christians. Yet these decrees were not all equally severe, nor all founded on the same causes. A celebrated lawyer, of the name of *Domitius*, anciently collected all the imperial laws against the christians, in his treatise *de Officio Proconsulis*;⁽⁶⁾

(3) In his History of the Jewish War. See also *Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs tom. I. cap. 17. *Schl.*]

(4) The writers on these persecutions, are enumerated by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang. toti orbi exoriens. cap. vii. p. 133, &c.

(5) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Historia sacra. Lib. II. c. 33. p. 387. ed. Horn. *Augustinus*, de Civit. Dei, L. xviii. c. 52. [In the fourth century, the number of the persecutions had not been defined. *Lactantius de Mortibus persecutorum*, reckons up only *six*. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. does not state their number; yet we might make out *nine* from this writer. This is the number given by *Sulpitius Severus*, in the fifth century. But in his times originated the opinion of just *ten* persecutions; and *Sulpitius*, to make out that number, includes the persecution of *Antichrist* in the end of the world. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. ante Con. Mag. p. 98, &c. *Schl.*]

(6) See *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar. Lib. v. c. 11. What remain of these laws,

which, if it were now extant, would doubtless throw much light on the history of the church under the pagan emperors. Now very much is left wholly to conjecture.

§ 6. As the Romans were not accustomed to trouble any people on account of their religion, and as they suffered the Jews in particular to live according to their own laws; it is not improperly asked, what could have induced them to heap so many evils on the heads of christians, whose religion was so holy, and so friendly both to public and private happiness? The *first* cause of this cruelty, I conceive to be, that the christians contemned and abhorred the public religion of the state, which was so closely connected with the form and administration of the government. For the Romans, though they tolerated all the religions from which the commonwealth had nothing to fear, yet would not suffer the ancient religion of their nation, as established by the laws, to be derided, and the people to be withdrawn from it. Yet both these, the christians dared to do. Nor did they assail only the Roman religion, but likewise the religions of all other nations. Hence the Romans concluded, that the christian sect was not only arrogant beyond all measure, but likewise unfriendly to the public peace and tranquillity, and calculated to excite civil wars. This, if I do not mistake, is that *odium generis humani*, with which *Tacitus* taxes the christians; and is the true ground of his denominating christianity, a *destructive superstition*, as well as of the epithet *malignant*, (*malefica*,) applied to it by *Suetonius*.(7)

§ 7. Another cause of the Roman hostility to christianity was, that the christian worship had nothing of what was common to all other religions. For the christians offered no sacrifices, and had no temples, no statues, no oracles, no order of priesthood; and the inconsiderate multitude deemed those who were without these, to be destitute of all religion, or to be *atheists*: and by the Roman laws, atheists were regarded as the pests of human society. Besides, the worship of so many pagan deities, afforded support to a countless throng of priests, augurs, soothsayers, merchants, and artists; all of whom were in danger of coming to want, if christianity should prevail; and therefore, with united strength, they rose up against it, and wished to exterminate its followers.(8)

are illustrated by *Fran. Baldwin*, Comment. ad edicta veter. princip. Romanor de Christianis; republished by *N. H. Gundling*, with *Baldwin's* *Constantinus Magnus*, Halle, 1727. 8vo.

(7) See *Tacitus*, Annals, Lib. xv. c. 34. *Suetonius*, Nero, cap. 16. Because, such as could not endure the sacred rites and the religion of the Romans, nor those of all the world, seemed to be the foes of mankind, and to indulge hatred towards all nations.

(8) See the account of *Demetrius* the silver-smith, Acts xix. 25. *Pliny*, Epistt. Lib. x. Ep. 97. "The temples, which were almost deserted, began to be frequent-

§ 8. They, whose interest it was to arrest the progress of christianity, in order to effect their object the sooner, disseminated among the vulgar, the basest calumnies against the christians, and their religion. These slanderous stories, the people, who were fickle and credulous, too easily accredited. What they were, may be learned from the writers of apologies for christianity in the early ages.(9) The same persons cunningly persuaded the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempests, and diseases, that afflicted mankind, were sent upon them by the angry gods because the christians, who contemned their authority, were every where tolerated.(10) Other, less weighty causes are here omitted.

§ 9. The various kinds of punishment, both capital and corrective, which were inflicted on those that venerated *Christ*, are described by learned men, in works professedly on that subject.(11) The manner of proceeding before the tribunals, may be seen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters which passed between *Pliny* and *Trajan*, and in other ancient documents.(12) But it is clear, that the mode of proceeding in the courts was not always the same. For the laws and the rescripts of the emperors, by which the magistrates were to be guided, were different at different periods. Thus, at one time, the christians were carefully sought after; at another, the judges waited till some one came forward to accuse them. Sometimes the confessing or convicted christian was hurried forthwith to execution, if he did not renounce his religion; at other times, the magistrates labored, by various species of torture and cruelty, to induce them to apostatize.

§ 10. Those who fell in these perilous days of the church, being put to death in different ways, were called *Martyrs*; a term borrowed from the sacred writings, and denoting that they were *witnesses* for *Christ*. Those who were bold to profess *Christ* before the magistrates, and for his sake incurred the loss of health, or goods, or honors, were denominated *confessors*. Both

ed again; and the sacred rites which had been long neglected, are again performed—The victims which hitherto had found *almost no purchasers*, begin to come again to the market" &c.

(9) This subject is nearly exhausted by *Chr. Kortholt*, *Paganus Obtrectator, seu de Calumniis gentilium in Christianos*, in III Books, Kilon. 1698. 4to. To which add *J. J. Huldreich*, *de Calumniis gentilium in Christianos*, Tiguri 1744. 8vo.

(10) See *Arnobius*, *adversus Gentes*. [and *Tertullian*, *Apologet.* c. 40. *Schl.*]

(11) *Anton. Gallonius* and *Casp. Sagittarius*, *de Cruciatibus Martyrum*; the latter printed at Jena, 1673. 4to. the best edition of the former is, Antw. 1668. 12mo. [Both contain mixtures of the doubtful with the true: for the *Acta Martyrum*, now extant, cannot be relied on. *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Chr.* &c.]

(12) See *J. H. Bæhmer*, *Jus Eccles. Protest.* tom. iv. Lib. v. *Decretal.* Tit. I. § 32.

obtained immense veneration and influence among the christians; and they enjoyed prerogatives and honors, which were altogether peculiar and extraordinary; and such as would furnish matter for a volume that would be useful in various respects. These prerogatives were undoubtedly conferred on the martyrs and confessors, to induce others more readily, to encounter evils of every kind, for Christ's sake.(13) But as all peculiar privileges, by the fault of men, degenerate into sources of evil, so these were conferred, not unfrequently, on the undeserving; and they served to encourage superstition and other evils.

§ 11. That a great number of persons of both sexes, and of every class and rank, suffered death for the cause of *Christ*, during the first three or four centuries, no impartial person acquainted with those times can entertain a doubt. But, since *H. Dodwell's* attempt to invalidate this ancient opinion,(14) many have agreed with him; and have maintained, that only a *few* actually suffered death, on account of the christian religion; but they have met with strenuous opposers, who regard this opinion as derogatory to that divine power, which sustained the martyrs in their conflicts. Those who take the middle path between these two extremes, will probably come nearest to the truth. The *martyrs* were not so numerous as they were anciently supposed to be, and as some still account them; but they were more numerous than *Dodwell* and his friends suppose them. Into this opinion, I think, *they* will most readily come, who learn from the ancient writers that even in the most calamitous times of the church, not *all* the christians, every where, were persecuted and arraigned for trial. Persons in the humbler conditions of life, were generally more safe; while greater danger impended over the rich, (whose wealth had charms for the judges,) and over the learned, the doctors and heads of churches, and over the eloquent and influential.(15)

(13) [This seems quite too philosophical an account of this matter. The early christians did not, thus coldly, calculate distant consequences and effects, in order to determine what place in their affections, and what rank in the church, they should give to their brethren and pastors who suffered and died for their religion. Nature, religion, and all the ties which united them to *Christ*, to the church, and to one another, combined to render these holy men and consistent christians venerable and lovely, in their eyes; and of course to procure them a rank and privileges in the church, altogether peculiar. Whoever reads the most authentic accounts of the ancient martyrs, of Polycarp, for instance, will see abundant evidence of the operation of these causes; but nothing of that calculating policy, of which Dr. *Mosheim* speaks. *Tr.*]

(14) In his noted Dissertation, de Paucitate martyrum, which is the eleventh among his Dissertt. Cyprianicæ.

(15) [See Martyrium Polycarpi, § 12. Acta Fructuosi, in *Ruinart's* Acta Martyr. sincera, p. 219. *Cyprian*, Epistt. v. and xiv. p. 10, and 23. ed. *Benedict*. and many others. *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M. p. 106. *Tr.*]

§ 12. The words and actions of the martyrs, from the time of their arrest till their last moments, were carefully committed to writing; in order to be read over on certain days for the edification of their successors in the church. But, only a few of these *Acta Martyrum* have reached us; (16) much the greater part of them having been committed to the flames, during the ten years war of *Diocletian* against the christians; for that emperor required all the books and papers of christians, at that time, to be collected and burned. From the eighth century onward, both the Greeks and the Latins took great pains to compile lives of the ancient martyrs; but the more discerning even in the Romish church, now admit, that the greater part of these accounts are mere fables, dressed up in a style of affected oratory. Nor is more credit due to those catalogues of saints, called *Martyrologies*, which were either compiled by ignorant and incompetent men, or have since been much falsified. Hence, this part of ecclesiastical history enjoys very little light.

§ 13. *Nero* was the first emperor that persecuted the christians; and his cruelty was extreme. He accused those innocent people of a crime which he himself had committed; namely, that of setting fire to the city of Rome. And to make the punishment correspond with the crime, he caused the streets of the city to be illuminated, through the night, by the burning bodies of many of them, [whom he had sewed up alive, in garments covered with pitch.] Others were put to death in a different manner. This persecution began in the middle of November A. D. 64. (17) In it, the ancients tell us, *Paul* and *Peter* suffered death at Rome: but many cannot bring themselves to believe this, because of its repugnance to chronology. (18) This persecution terminated at the death of *Nero*; who is well known to have been his own executioner, A. D. 68. For about *four years*, therefore, the christians suffered every species of cruelty at his hands.

(16) Such of them as were not wholly unworthy of credit, were collected in a moderate sized folio, by *Theod. Ruinart*, *Selecta et sincera Martyrum Acta*, Amstelod. 1713.

(17) See the two French dissertations of *Alph. de Vignoles*, on the Cause and the Commencement of *Nero's* persecution; in *Phil. Masson's* *Histoire critique de la Republique des Letters*, tom. viii. p. 74—117. and tom. ix. p. 172—186. See also *Toinard* on *Lactantius de mortibus persecutorum*, p. 398.

(18) *Sebast. Tillemont*, *Histoire des Empereurs*, tom. i. p. 564 &c, and *Barattier*, de Successione Romanor. Pontiff. cap. v. p. 60. [All agree that both these apostles, *Paul* and *Peter*, were put to death in the reign of *Nero*: but in respect to the year and the place, there is controversy. Many question whether both suffered at the same time. They believe, according to the testimony of *Prudentius*, (*Peristephan. de passione beator. Apostolor. Petri et Pauli*, v. 5, 6.) that *Peter* suffered one year earlier than *Paul*; but on the same day. As to the day on which *Paul* suffered, some make it the 29th of June; and others, the 23d of February. The year is, by some, determined to A. D. 64. so *von Henschen*,

§ 14. How far the persecution under *Nero* extended, is not agreed among the learned. For, while the greater number suppose it spread over the whole Roman *empire*, there are those who think it was confined to the *city* of Rome. The former opinion, which is the more ancient, (19) appears to us, best supported. We do not hesitate to join with those who think that public laws were enacted against the whole body of christians, and were sent abroad into the provinces. To this opinion we are led, among other reasons, by the authority of *Tertullian*, who clearly intimates that *Nero*, as well as *Domitian*, enacted laws against the christians, which laws *Trajan*, in part repealed or annulled. (20) The noted Spanish or Portuguese *inscription*, in which *Nero* is commended for having purged the province of the *new superstition*, is suspected by the Spaniards themselves; and I place no reliance on it. (21) The christians moreover were condemned,

Acta Sanctor. April. tom. i. *D. Papebroch*, Propylaeum ad *Acta S. May.* *Anton. Pagi*, *Critica in Annal. Baron.* tom. i. p. 51, 52. [*Pagi* is decided for A. D. 65.] by others, A. D. 65. and again by others A. D. 67. so *Baumgarten*; and lastly by others A. D. 68. so *John Pearson*, *Annales Paulini*, p. 25. which is the most probable opinion. The day, when both apostles suffered, was probably, the 22d, of February. That *Paul* was beheaded during *Nero's* persecution, is supported by the testimony of *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* L. ii. c. 25. and of *Lactantius*, *de Morte Persecutorum*, cap. ii. p. 1375. ed. Bünemann. As to the place, an obscure writer, *Utr. Velenus*, in a book, *Quo Petrus Romam non venisse demonstratur*, 1660. 4to. p. 40. denies that either apostle suffered at Rome; and endeavors to prove, that their martyrdom was at Jerusalem: which also *Bale* maintains in regard to *Peter*, *Centur. Scriptor. Britan.* p. 16. This opinion is confuted by various writers, who are mentioned in *Walch's Biblioth. theol. Selecta*, tom. iii. p. 458. On this whole subject, consult *W. Cave*, *Life of Paul*, c. vii. § 9. p. 424. of his *Antiq. Apostol.* *Tillemont. Mem. pour servir à l'histoire de l'église* tom. i. Pt. II. not. 42. p. 768. and *Fabricius Codex Apocryph. N. T.* Pt. I. p. 450. On the fabulous circumstances related of *Paul's* martyrdom, see *J. G. Walch's Hist. Eccles. N. T.* p. 277. *Schl.*—On the chronology of *Paul's* life and labors, see *Witsii Meltemata Leidensia*, 1703. 4to. *Pearson*, *Annales Paul.* the Introductions to the N. T. by *Eichhorn*, *Bertholt*, *Horne* &c. and other works referred to in *Winer's Biblischerealew. art. Paul.* *Tr.*]

(19) The first who rejected the common opinion, so far as I know, was *Fran. Balduin*, [an eminent civilian of Paris, who died AD. 1573,] in his *Comment. ad edicta Imperator. in Christianos*, p. 27, 28. After him, *Jo. Launqi*, in *Diss. qua Sulpitii Severi locus de prima martyrum Galliae epocha vindicatur*, § 1. p. 139, 140. tom. II. P. I. of his works. Still more learned, and on the same side, was *Henry Dodwell*, *Diss. xi.* in his *Dissertt. Cyprianicæ*, § xiii. p. 59. whom many others have followed: [among whom, are *Jo. le Clerc*, *Histor. Eccles. N. T.* Century I. p. 428. *Joach. Lange*, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 360. *Nicol. Gurtler*, *Syst. theol. prophet.* p. 491. *Baumgarten*, *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* vol. I. p. 376. (who supposes the persecution extended only so far as the power of the Prætorian Prefect;)] *D. Semler*, *Sel. Capita Hist. Eccles.* tom. I. p. 24. (Also, *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *Handbuch der christl. Kirchengesch.* vol. I. p. 120 and *A. Neander*, *Algem. Gesch. d. christl. Kirch.* vol. I. Pt. I. p. 137 *Tr.*)—The arguments for both opinions are stated in *J. G. Walch*, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 548. who thinks the question to be altogether doubtful. *Jablonsky* was of the same sentiment, *Institut. Historiæ Christ. antiq.* p. 40. *Schl.*]

(20) *Tertullian*, *Apologet.* cap. iv. p. 46. edit. Havercamp.

(21) This *inscription* may be seen in *J. Gruterus*, *Inscriptionum* tom. I. p. ccxxxviii. n. 9. [It is this: "Neroni, ob provinciam latronibus et his, qui novam

not so much for their religion, as on the charge of having set fire to Rome.(22) But who can suppose, that a religious sect, which the emperor himself charged with such a crime, would be quietly tolerated by him beyond the limits of Rome.(23)

generi humano *superstitionem* inculcabant, purgatam." Tr.] But the best Spanish writers do not venture to defend the authority of this inscription; because it has not been seen by any one; and *Cyriac* of *Ancona*, who first produced it, is acknowledged by all, to be unworthy of credit. I will subjoin the decision of that excellent and judicious historian of Spain, *Jo. de Ferreras*, *Histoire generale d'Espagne*, tom. I. p. 192. "I cannot refrain from remarking, that *Cyriac* of *Ancona* was the first that published this inscription, and that from him all others have derived it. But as the credibility of this writer is suspected in the judgment of all the learned, and as not a vestige nor any recollection of this inscription remains, in the places where it is said to have been found, and no one knows now where to find it; every one may form such opinion of it, as he pleases."

(22) See *Theod. Ruinart*, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta*. p. xxxi. &c.

(23) [Nearly all the facts relating to this persecution, except the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, we owe to *Tacitus*, the Roman historian. *Annals*. Lib. xv. c. 44. After describing the conflagration, which utterly consumed three of the fourteen wards, and spread ruin in seven others; and likewise the efforts of Nero to soothe the indignant and miserable citizens; he says: "But no human aid, no munificence of the prince, nor expiations of the gods, removed from him the infamy of having ordered the conflagration. Therefore, to stop the clamor, Nero falsely accused and subjected to the most exquisite punishments a people hated for their crimes, called *christians*. The founder of the sect, *Christ*, was executed in the reign of *Tiberius*, by the procurator *Pontius Pilate*. The pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, burst forth again; not only through Judea, the birth place of the evil, but at Rome also, where every thing atrocious and base centers and is in repute. Those first seized, confessed; then a vast multitude, detected by their means, were convicted, not so much of the crime of burning the city, as of hatred to mankind. And insult was added to their torments; for being clad in skins of wild beasts, they were torn to pieces by dogs; or affixed to crosses to be burned, were used as lights, to dispel the darkness of night, when the day was gone. Nero devoted his gardens to the shew, and held *Circensian* games, mixing with the rabble, or mounting a chariot, clad like a coachman. Hence, though the guilty and those meriting the severest punishment, suffered; yet compassion was excited, because they were destroyed, not for the public good, but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual."—It appears from this account, that a vast multitude (*multitudo ingens*) suffered at Rome,—and suffered in a most inhuman manner;—that they were falsely accused, and by Nero's instigation; not because he had any thing against them, but because they were a despised people, and he hoped to avert the public odium from himself. But the cause was too plain; their innocence was known, and Nero's fiendlike merriment only raised compassion towards them, and increased the odium against him. It is clear, from this account, that the christians, in the opinion of *Tacitus*, deserved to be exterminated for their religion; yet that Nero did not proceed on this ground, but on the false charge of their having kindled the fires of Rome. *Lactantius*, then, (*de Morte persecutorum*, cap. II.) erred in attributing other designs to Nero, namely the extermination of the *christian religion*. The commencement of this persecution is determined, by the time of the conflagration, which *Tacitus* says, (*Annals* xv. 33, 41.) began the 18th of July, AD. 65, (or xiv. Kalend. Sextiles. C. Lecanio, and M. Licinio Coss.) and lasted six days. Some time after, but in the same year, the persecution broke out. But how long it continued, is uncertain. If *Paul* and *Peter* suffered in the very last year of Nero's reign, as the fathers state, (*Eusebius*, *Chronicon*; and *Jerome* *de Viris illustr.* c. I. and V.) the persecution doubtless ceased, only on Nero's death. But if they suffered earlier, then we have no proof of the continuance of the persecution so long—As to the extent of the persecution, it is wholly in the dark. If we consider simply the description of it, or the causes from which it originated, and the feelings of Nero

§ 15. *Nero* being dead, the fury of this first war against the christians ceased. But in the year 93 or 94, (24) a new assault was made upon them by *Domitian*, an emperor little inferior to *Nero* in baseness of character and conduct. (25) The cause of the persecution, if we give credit to *Hegesippus*, was the fear of losing his empire: for the emperor had learned in some way that a person would arise from among the relatives of *Christ*, who would attempt a revolution, and would produce commotion in the empire. (26) This persecution undoubtedly was severe: but it was of short continuance, as the emperor was soon after murdered. (27)

towards the christians, we have no reason to suppose it extended beyond the city of Rome, and its neighborhood. Yet the general impression in former ages, and the belief of many in this age, make the persecution a general one. The only argument of much plausibility for this opinion, is derived from a passage in *Tertullian*, (*Apologet.* cap. iv. p. 46. ed. Havercamp.) where he speaks of the persecuting laws of the empire, as being enacted by the very vilest and most odious among the emperors, and mentions *Nero* as the first that “drew the sword” against the christians; and *Domitian* as the second who did so. Whence it is inferred, that *Nero*, as well as *Domitian*, must have enacted public laws against the christians; and of course, that the persecution in *Nero*’s reign must have been general, or throughout the empire. But considering the fervid, rhetorical style of *Tertullian*, this seems to be a slender foundation, on which to ground a conclusion, that has no support from well attested facts. *Tr.*]

(24) The precise year, in which the persecution by *Domitian* began, is not certain. *Toinard* has discussed the point, in his notes on *Lactantius de Morte Persecutorum*. Chap. III. That it *raged* in the year 95, is stated by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* III. 18, but how long before this it *commenced*, is not clear.—*Pagi*, (*Crit. annal. Baron.* tom. I. p. 85, 87.) supposes it began AD. 93.—*Toinard*, (*ubi supra.*) AD. 94. and *Dodwell*, (*Diss. Cyprian.* xi. p. 71.) AD. 95. *Mosheim*, (*de Reb. Christ. ante C. M.*) says, AD. 94 or 95. *Tr.*]

(25) See *Theod. Ruinart*, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum*. p. xxxii. [*Thom. Ittig Selecta Hist. Eccles. capita. sæcul. I. cap. 6. § 11. p. 531. Schl.*]

(26) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. III. c. 19, 20. [In this simple, unvarnished story, there is nothing difficult to be believed. It is therefore credible, that some enemy of both Jews and christians, suggested to the emperor, that the Jews were expecting a king of David’s line, who would give laws to the world; and that the christians, likewise believed, that Christ would re-appear, and set up a splendid kingdom; that from both these classes of people, insurrections and trouble were to be feared: and that the tyrant, enraged by the suggestions of the insidious foe, ordered all the posterity of *David* to be sought out and to be put to death; and to prevent the christians from making disturbance, he commanded them to be put under restraints, or to be punished with severity. *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 111.]

(27) The termination of this persecution, is stated differently by the ancients. Some say, that *Domitian* himself put an end to it before his death. *Hegesippus* (in *Eusebius*, *Eccl. Hist.* L. III. c. 20.) states that *Domitian* having learned that there were christians of the lineage of David, and kinsmen of Christ, still living in Palestine, had them brought to Rome, and interrogated them closely respecting their pedigree, their wealth, and the future kingdom of Christ. And from their answers and their whole appearance, he concluded, he had nothing to fear from them, and dismissed them; and thereupon, he published a decree, terminating the persecution. So likewise, *Tertullian*, (*Apologet.* cap. v. p. 60.) says of *Domitian*: “He *receded* from his attempt, and *recalled* those he had banished.” But *Lactantius*, (*de Morte persecutorum*, cap. 3.) represents his acts and edicts as repealed, *after his death*, when it was, that the church recovered its former state. And *Xiphilin*, on *Nerva*, (*Dion Cassius*, L. lxxviii. c. 1. abridged

The principal martyrs named, are, *Flavius Clemens*, a consul, and *Flavia Domitilla*,⁽²⁸⁾ his niece or wife. In the midst of this persecution, *John*, the apostle, was banished to the isle of Patmos ; but whether he was first cast into a caldron of boiling oil, by order of the emperor, and came out alive and unhurt, though asserted by *Tertullian* and others, has appeared to many to be uncertain.⁽²⁹⁾

by Xiphilin,) says, that " Nerva recalled those banished for impiety," i. e. the christians. Perhaps *Domitian* published an edict favorable to the christians a little before his death, the benefits of which they began to enjoy, first, after his decease. *Schl.*]

⁽²⁸⁾ See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. III. c. 18. and *Chronicon*, ann. 95. Some have supposed, that the wife and niece of Clemens both had the same name ; and that the first was banished to the island *Pandataria*, near Italy ; and the second, to another island called *Pontia*. See *Tillemont Mem. pour servir a l'histoire de l'eglise*, tom. II. p. 124 &c. and *Flexry*, History of the church. Lib. II. § 52. *Schl.*]

⁽²⁹⁾ See the amicable discussion, between the Rev. Mr. *Hermann* and myself, in my *Syntagma Diss. ad Historiam eccles. pertinentium*, tom. I. p. 497—546. [The whole controversy seems to rest on a passage in *Tertullian*, de Præscript. adv. hæret. c. 36. as the only original authority for the story, which is, in itself, improbable. All the more discerning, of late, either doubt or deny the truth of the story. *Tr.*]

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. The state of philosophy in the East, little known.—§ 2. Philosophy of the Persians, Chaldeans, and Arabians.—§ 3. Jewish and Egyptian wisdom.—§ 4. The proper oriental philosophy.—§ 5. Its first principles.—§ 6. Its patrons not agreed in their opinions.—§ 7. Its precepts concerning God.—§ 8. Concerning the origin of the world.—§ 9. Concerning human souls.—§ 10. The Jewish philosophy.—§ 11. Grecian learning.—§ 12. Roman learning and philosophy.—§ 13. Attention to science in other nations.

§ 1. If it were known what opinions were advanced and maintained, by the men of most intelligence among the oriental nations, at the time when the christian religion began to enlighten mankind, many things in the early history of the church might be more fully and more accurately explained. But, only a few fragments of oriental philosophy, as all know, have come down to us; and those which have reached us, still need the labors of a learned man to collect them all, arrange them properly, and expound them wisely.(1)

§ 2. The prevailing system in Persia was, that of the Magi; who, as is well known, held to two principles or deities, as governors of the universe: the one good, the other evil. The followers of this system, however, were not agreed, in respect to the precise nature of these first principles.(2) Yet this doctrine spread over no small portion of Asia and Africa, and particularly over Chaldea, Assyria, Syria, and Egypt, though under different modifications: nor did it leave the Jews untinged with its principles.(3) The Arabians of that and the subsequent ages, were more remarkable for strength and courage than for intellectual

(1) There is extant an English work of *Thomas Stanley*, on the history of oriental philosophy, which *J. le Clerc* translated into Latin. But that learned man has left the field of oriental philosophy not to be gleaned only, but to be reaped, by others. He is much inferior both in genius and erudition, to *Ja. Brucker*; whose history of philosophy should by all means be consulted.

(2) See *Tho. Hyde*, *Historia religionis veterum Persarum*, Oxon. 1700. 4to.—a very learned work, but ill digested, and full of improbable conjectures.

(3) See *Jo. Christoph. Wolf*, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, Hamb. 1707. 8vo.—also *Mosheim*, *Notes on Cudworth's Intellectual System*, p. 328. 423 &c.

culture; for they attained to no celebrity for learning, before the times of *Muhammed*. This their own writers do not deny.(4)

§ 3. The Indians, from the earliest times, were much famed for their love of profound knowledge. Of their philosophical tenets we could perhaps form an opinion, at the present day, if their very ancient sacred book which they denominate *Veda* or *the law*, were brought to light, and translated into some language better known. The accounts given by travellers among the Indians, concerning this book, are so contradictory and fluctuating, that we must wait for further information.(5) The Egyptians

(4) See *Abulpharajus*, de Moribus Arabum, p. 6. published by *Pocock*.

(5) I have recently learned, that this most desirable book has been obtained; by some French Jesuits residing in India; and that it has been, or will be, deposited in the king of France's library. See Lettre du P. Calmette à M. de Cartigny, dans les Lettres edifiantes et Curieuses des Miss. Etrangères. xxi. Recueil p. 455 &c. and xiii. Rec. p. 161.—[The Hindoo literature and theology were little known, when Dr. Mosheim wrote. Since that time, and especially since the establishment of the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, by Sir Wm. Jones in 1793, this field of knowledge has been explored with equal industry and success. See the Asiatic Researches, 13 vol. 4to. Sir Wm. Jones' works. 6 vol. 4to. Rev Wm. Ward's View of the Hist. &c. of the Hindoos, 3 vol. 8vo. and numerous other works.—But it is not true, that the Vedas have been brought to Europe, as Dr. Mosheim had been informed. On the contrary Mr. Holbrooke, in the 8th vol. of the Asiatic Res. describes them as not worth translating. He says: "They are too voluminous for a complete translation of the whole; and what they contain would hardly reward the labor of the reader; much less that of the translator." The Vedas are four in number, called Rig Veda, Yajush Veda, Saman Veda, and Atharvan Veda. The first consists of 5 sections, in 10,000 verses; the second is divided into 80 sections, in 9,000 verses; the third consists of 1000 sections, and 3,000 verses; the fourth, of nine sections, with subdivisions, and 6,000 verses. Besides the four Vedas, the Hindoos have 14 other sacred books, of later date and inferior authority; viz. four Upavedas, six Angas, and four Upangas. All these were supposed to be the productions of divine persons, and to contain all true knowledge secular as well as sacred. The commentaries on these books, the compilations from them, and digests of their principles, are almost innumerable, and constitute the whole encyclopædia of the Hindoos. Several of these have been translated into European languages: namely, *L'Ezour-Vedam*, or ancien commentaire du Vedam &c. à Yverdon, 1778. 2 vol. 12mo.—The *Bhagavat-Geeta*, or Dialogues of Kreesna and Arjoon, in eighteen Lectures, with notes by Cha. Wilkins, Lond. 1785. 4to.—*Bagavadam*, ou doctrine divine, ouvrage Indien canonique sur l'Etre supreme, les dieux, les géans, les hommes, les diverses parties de l'univers. (by Foucher d'Osseville,) à Paris. 1788. 8vo.—*Oupnekhut*, h. e. Decretum legendum, opus ipsa in India rarissimum, continens antiquam et arcanam, seu theolog. et philosoph. doctrinam, e quatuor sacris Indorum libris—excerptam,—e Persico idiomate—in Latium verum,—studio et opera Anquetil du Perron. 1801—2, 2 vol. 4to.—Institutes of Hindoo Law, or the ordinances of Menu, translated by Sir Wm. Jones. Lond. 1796. 8vo. The last is supposed to follow, next after the Vedas in age. Sir Wm. Jones thinks it was, most probably, compiled about 880 years before Christ; and the Vedas about 300 years earlier. The other sacred books of the Hindoos are much later; yet all are now ancient. From the similarity of views between the Hindoo philosophers and those of Greece, it has been thought, that they must have had some intercourse, or that one borrowed from the other. The ideas of the fathers in the christian church, and of some moderns, would make the Greeks indebted to the Orientals,—but Christoph. Meiners (Historia doctrinæ de uno Deo,) and others would reverse the stream of philosophic knowledge, by supposing it fol-

were unquestionably divided into various sects, disagreeing in opinion: (6) so that it is a vain attempt of some, to reduce the philosophy of this people to one system.

§ 4. But of all the different systems of philosophy that were received in Asia and in a part of Africa in the age of our Savior, none was so detrimental to the christian church, as that which was styled *γνῶσις* or *science*; i. e. the *way to the knowledge of the true God*; and which we have above called the *oriental philosophy*, in order to distinguish it from the Grecian. For from this school, issued the leaders and founders of those sects, which during the three first centuries disturbed and troubled the christian church. They endeavored to accommodate the simple and pure doctrines of christianity to the tenets of their philosophy; and in doing so, they produced various fantastic and strange notions, and obtruded upon their followers systems of doctrine, partly ludicrous, and partly intricate and obscure, in a very high degree. The ancient Greek and Latin fathers, who contended against these sects, supposed indeed that their sentiments were derived from *Plato*; but those good men, being acquainted with no philosophy but the Grecian, and ignorant of every thing oriental, were deceived by the resemblance between some of the doctrines of *Plato* and those embraced by these sects. Whoever compares the Platonic philosophy carefully with the Gnostic, will readily see that they are widely different. (7)

lowed the march of *Alexander's* army, from Greece to India. This intercourse between the Indians and the Greeks, seems not to have been of long continuance. If it commenced with *Alexander's* Indian expedition, it can scarcely have lasted 80 years; for the conquest of Media, Persia, and Babylonia, by the Parthians, about 250 years before Christ, and the establishment of their empire in those countries, formed a strong barrier to all further intercourse; and the subversion of the kingdom of the Seleucidae by the Romans, B. C. 65. must be supposed to be the utmost limits, to which it *could* extend. If we consider the flourishing state of the Grecian philosophy before the Asiatic conquests of *Alexander*, and the silence of the western philosophers respecting their intercourse with India during the period supposed; it would seem more probable, that the Indian philosophy was derived from the Grecian, than the latter from the former. It is to be hoped, this subject will receive more light from the investigations which are going forward with such success, in the present age. Tr.]

(6) See Dr. *Mosheim's* notes on *Cudworth's* Intellectual System. tom. i. p. 415.

(7) [Dr. *Mosheim* in this and the four following sections, describes an *oriental philosophy*, the supposed parent of the Gnostic systems, as if its existence was universally admitted, and its character well understood. Yet the system here described, is of his own formation; being such a system, as must have existed, according to his judgment, in order to account for the Gnosticism of the early ages. In his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 19—21.—and in his *Diss. de Causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos Sæculi primi et secundi*, § 3—6. (inter *Dissertt. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, vol. i. p. 223—232.) he confesses that he has little evidence, except the *necessity* of the supposition, for the existence of this philosophy. He also admits, that the fathers knew nothing of it; and he might have added, that they testify that *Gnosticism* had no existence, till the days of *Adrian*, in the *second* century. Since Dr. *Mosheim* wrote, some

§ 5. The first principles of this philosophy, seem to have been the dictates of mere reason. For the author of it undoubtedly thus reasoned : There is much evil in the world ; and men are hurried on as by the instinct of nature, to what reason condemns. Yet that eternal mind, from whom all other spirits emanated, is doubtless perfectly free from evil, or is infinitely good and beneficent. Hence the source of the evils with which the world abounds, must be something *external* to the Deity. But there is nothing external to him, except what is material : and therefore *matter* is to be regarded as the source and origin of all evil and all vice. From these principles the conclusion was, that matter existed eternally, and independently of God ; and that it received its present form and organization, not from the will or fiat of God, but from the operations of some being of a nature inferior to God ; in other words, that the world and the human race came from the forming hand, not of the supreme Deity, but of one of inferior capacity and perfections. For who can believe, that the supreme God, who is infinitely removed from all evil, would mould and fashion

few have believed with him ; others have rejected his hypothesis altogether ; and others again have taken a middle course, which is probably the nearest to the truth. These last suppose, that the Jews, and the Greeks of Asia and Egypt, imbibed something of the *spirit, common to most of the Asiatic wise men*, and which shows itself in the Braminic, the Zoroastrian, and the Sufi or Persian speculations ; namely, a disposition to indulge the *imagination*, and to depend on *contemplation* rather than ratiocination, as the means of arriving at truth. Something of *this spirit*, appears also in the Platonic philosophy, especially in the later or Eclectic Platonism. Besides, the Asiatics in all ages, like the early Grecian philosophers, were much inclined to limit their philosophical speculations to *cosmogony* ; and likewise to adopt, as the supposed first or grand operative cause, a *physical*, rather than an intelligent principle ; or in other words, to attribute the origin of all things, to *generation, vegetation, emanation, attraction*, or some such *natural* operation, rather than to the contrivance and the fiat of an almighty and intelligent Spirit. Hence the Jews and some early christian sects, without embracing the peculiar tenets of the Magi, or of any other philosophers, oriental or occidental, yet imbibing the Asiatic *spirit* of searching after wisdom by means of *contemplation* rather than ratiocination, and at the same time leaning towards the supremacy of *physical* causes, were led to frame systems of philosophical divinity altogether peculiar. Such was, probably, the origin of the Jewish Kabbalistic system ; and also of those multifarious systems, which bore the common name of Gnosticism. Elaborate attempts have been made, to trace these systems back to some species of pagan philosophy as their legitimate source ; but with very little success. They seem to have originated in the speculations of Jews and christians, who indulged their own fancies, and explained the principles of revealed religion in a manner peculiar to themselves. That Gnosticism as such, had no existence in the *first* century, and that it is in vain sought for in the N. Testament, appears to be satisfactorily proved, by C. C. Tittmann, Tractatus de vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quæsitis, Lips. 1773. pp. 253. 12mo. That notwithstanding many points of resemblance can be traced, it is materially different from any system of either Grecian or oriental philosophy, it is the object of F. Ant. Lewald to show, Comment. ad historiam &c. de doctrina Gnostica, Heidelberg. 1818. pp. 157. 12mo.—For very ingenious and profound speculations on the subject generally, see Aug. Neander, Allgem. Gesch. der christl. Religion und Kirche, Vol. i. Pt. II. p. 627—670. Tr.]

matter which is in its nature evil and corrupt, and would impart to it any portion of his rich gifts ? But attempting to go farther, and to explain *how*, or by what accident or operator, that rude and malignant substance, called matter, became so skilfully arranged and organized ; and especially, how souls of celestial origin became joined with bodies composed of it, both reason and common sense forsook them. They therefore resorted to their imaginative faculty, and to mere fictions, in order to explain the origin of the world and of mankind.

§ 6. But as those, who undertake to explain what is obscure and difficult of solution by means of mere conjecture, can very seldom agree ; so those who attempted to solve this difficulty, split into various sects. Some conceived there must be *two eternal first principles*, the one presiding over *light*, the other over *matter* ; and by the contests between these principles, they accounted for the mixture of good and evil in our world. Others assigned to matter, not an *eternal lord*, but an *architect* merely ; and they supposed, that some one of those immortal beings whom God produced from himself, was induced by some unforeseen event, to attempt the reduction of matter which lay remote from the residence of God, into some kind of order, and also to fabricate men. Others again, imagined a sort of *Triumvirate* ; for they distinguished the supreme Deity, from the prince of matter and the author of all evil on the one hand, and from the architect and builder of the world on the other. When these three systems came to be dilated and explained, new controversies unavoidably arose, and numerous divisions followed ; as might be expected from the nature of the case, and as the history of those christian sects which followed this philosophy, expressly declares.

§ 7. Yet, as all these sects set out upon one and the same first principle, their disagreements did not prevent their holding certain doctrines and opinions in common, respecting God, the world, mankind, and some other points. They all therefore, maintained the existence from eternity of a Being, full of goodness, wisdom, and the other virtues, of whom no mortal can form a complete idea,—a Being, who is the purest *light*, and is diffused through that boundless *space* to which they gave the Greek appellation of *Pleroma* ; that this eternal and most perfect Being, after existing alone and in absolute repose during an infinite period, produced out of himself two spirits, of different sexes, and both perfect resemblances of their parent ; that from the marriage of these two spirits, others of a similar nature originated ; that successive generations ensued ; and thus in process of time a *celestial family* was formed in the *Pleroma*. This divine progeny, being immortal and unchangeable in their nature, these philosophers were dis-

posed to call 'Αἰῶνες, *Aeons*; a term which signifies *eternal* and beyond the influence of time and its vicissitudes.(8) But how numerous these *Aeons* were, was a subject of controversy among them.

§ 8. Beyond the region of light where God and his family dwell, exists a rude and unformed mass of matter, heaving itself continually in wild commotion. This mass, one of the celestial family, at a certain time either accidentally wandering beyond the Pleroma, or sent out by the Deity, undertook to reduce to order, to decorate with various gifts, and to people with human beings and animals of different species, and finally to endow and enrich with some portions of the celestial light or substance. This Builder of the world, who was distinct from the supreme God, they called the *Demiurge*. He is a being who, though possessed of many shining qualities, is arrogant in his very nature, and much inclined to domination. He therefore claims absolute authority over the new world he has built, as being his sovereign right, to the exclusion altogether of the supreme God; and he requires of mankind to pay divine honors exclusively to him, and to his associates.

§ 9. Man is composed of a terrestrial and therefore a vicious body, and of a celestial soul, which is in some sense a particle of the Deity himself. This nobler part, the soul, is miserably oppressed by the body, which is the seat of his base lusts; for it is not only drawn away by it from the knowledge and worship of the true God, to give homage and reverence to the Demiurge and his associates, but it is likewise filled and polluted with the love of terrestrial objects and sensual pleasures. From this wretched bondage, God labors to rescue his daughters, in various ways; and especially by the messengers whom he often sends to them,

(8) The word αἰών properly signifies an *infinite* or at least indefinite *duration*, and is opposed to a finite or a temporary duration. But by metonymy, it was used to designate immutable *beings* who exist for ever. It was so used, even by the Greek philosophers, about the commencement of the christian era; as appears from a passage in *Arrian*, Diss. Epictet. Lib. II. § 5. where αἰών is opposed to ἄνθρωπος or to a frail, changeable being. 'Οὐ γὰρ ἐμὶ αἰὼν ἀλλ' ἄνθρωπος, μέρος τῶν πάντων, ὥς ὥρα ἡμέρας, ἐνστέηναι με δεῖ ὥς τὴν ὥραν, καὶ παρελθεῖν ὥς ὥραν. I am not an *Aeon*, (an eternal and unchangeable being,) but a *man*; and a part of the universe, as an hour is a part of the day; like an hour I must exist, and then pass away.—It was therefore not a novel application of the term αἰών by the Gnostics, to use it as the designation of a celestial and immortal *being*. And even the fathers of the ancient church apply the term to *angels*, both good and bad. That *all* who were addicted to the oriental philosophy, whether Greeks or not, used the term in this sense, appears from a passage in *Manes*, the Persian, who, as *Augustine* testifies, called the celestial beings αἰῶνες, or, as *Augustine* translates it, *sæcula*. Some have supposed it so used even in the New Test. e. g. Ephes. ii. 2. and Heb. i. 2. *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M. p. 30.]

But the Demiurge and his associates, eager to retain their power, resist in all possible ways, the divine purpose of recalling souls back to himself; and with great pains, labor to obscure and efface all knowledge of the supreme Deity. In this state of conflict, such souls as renounce the framers and rulers of the world, and aspire after God their parent, and suppress the emotions excited by depraved matter, will when freed from the body ascend immediately to the Pleroma; while those, which continue in the bondage of superstition and of corrupt matter, must pass into other bodies; till they awake from this sinful lethargy. Yet God will ultimately prevail; and having restored to liberty most of the souls now imprisoned in bodies, will dissolve the fabric of the world; and then the primitive tranquillity will return, and God will reign with the happy spirits in undisturbed felicity to all eternity.

§ 10. The state of learning and especially of philosophy among the Jews, is manifest from what has already been said respecting the condition of that nation. It appears from the books of the New Testament, that the recondite science which they called *Kabbala*, was then taught and inculcated by not a few among them. This science was in many respects, very similar to that philosophy which we have called *oriental*; or rather, it is this philosophy itself, accommodated to the Jewish religion, and tempered with some mixture of truth. Nor were the Jews, at that time, wholly ignorant of the doctrines of the Grecian sages; for some of these doctrines had, from the days of *Alexander the Great*, been incorporated into the Jewish religion. Of the opinions which they had adopted from the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and the Syrians, I shall say nothing.(9)

§ 11. The Greeks are regarded by most writers, as continuing to hold the first rank in learning and philosophy. There were among them at that time, especially at Athens, acute and eloquent men, who taught the precepts of philosophy, as held by the ancient sects founded by Plato, Aristotle, Zeno and Epicurus; and who also instructed youth in the principles of eloquence, and in the liberal arts. So that those who were eager for learning, resorted to Greece from all quarters. And at Alexandria in Egypt, Grecian philosophers and rhetoricians were no less numerous; so that thither also, there was a general resort of scholars, as to a literary market.

§ 12. Among the Romans in this age, every branch of learning and science was cultivated. The children of good families were,

(9) See *J. F. Buddeus*, *Introductio in historiam philos. Hebraeorum*; and the writers named by *Wofilus*, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, tom. III. [but especially, *Brucker's Hist. crit philos.* tom. II. period II. Pt. I. L. II. c. i. p. 652. *Schm.*]

from their earliest years, instructed especially in Grecian learning and eloquence ; they next applied themselves to philosophy and the civil law ; and at last repaired to Greece, to complete their education.(10) Among the sects of philosophers, none were more acceptable to the Romans, than the Epicureans and Academics ; whom the leading men followed in great numbers, in order to indulge themselves in a life of pleasure without fear or remorse. While *Augustus* reigned, the cultivation of the fine arts was held in high honor. But after his death, the succeeding emperors being more intent on the arts of war than those of peace, these studies gradually sunk into neglect,

§ 13. The other nations, as the Germans, Celtes, and Britains, were certainly not destitute of men distinguished for their genius and acumen. In Gaul, the inhabitants of Marseilles had long been much famed for their attention to learning : (11) and they had, doubtless, diffused knowledge among the neighboring tribes. Among the Celtes, the *Druids* who were priests, philosophers, and legislators, were renowned for their wisdom ; but the accounts of them now extant, are not sufficient to acquaint us with the nature of their philosophy.(12) The Romans moreover introduced literature and philosophy into all the countries which they brought under their subjection, for the purpose of softening their savage tempers, and promoting their civilization.(13)

(10) See *Paganini Gaudentii liber de Philosophiae apud Romanos initio et progressu*, in the 5th vol. of the *Nova variorum scriptorum collectio*, Halle, 1747. 8vo. 2d edition.

(11) See the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, par des Religieux Benedictins, Diss. prelim. p. 42 &c.

(12) *Ja. Martini*, Religion des Gaulois, Liv. I. cap 21. p. 175. and various others, who have written concerning the Druids. [This work of *Martin*, is said to be far inferior to the following ; viz. *Histoire des Celtes et particulièrement des Gaulois et des Germains*—par *Sim. Pelloutier*, augmentée par *M. de Chénier*. Paris, 1771. 8vol. 12mo. and 2 vol. 4to.—also *Freret*, Obs. sur la nature et les dogmes—de la relig. Gauloise ; in the *Histoire de l'Acad. des Inscript.* tome xviii.—and his *Obs. sur la relig. des Gaulois*, &c. in the *Memoires de Litterature*, tirés des registres de l'Acad. des Inscript. tome xxiv. Paris, 1756.—Also the Introductory part of *Alsatia Illustrata*—autore *J. Dan. Schoepflino*, tom. I. § 96. Colmar. 1751. Fcl. Tr.]

(13) *Juvenal*, Satyra xv. 110—113,

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Necessity of teachers in the church.—§ 2. Extraordinary teachers.—§ 3. Authority of the apostles.—§ 4. The seventy disciples.—§ 5. Christ no where determined the form of his church. Constitution of the church of Jerusalem.—§ 6. Rights of the people. Contributions for the public expense.—§ 7. Equality of the members. Rites of initiation. Catechumens and the faithful.—§ 8. Order of rulers. Presbyters.—§ 9. Prophets.—§ 10. Deacons of the church at Jerusalem. Deaconesses.—§ 11. Bishops.—§ 12. Character of episcopacy in this century.—§ 13. Origin of dioceses, and rural bishops.—§ 14. Whether there were councils and metropolitans in the *first* century.—§ 15. The principal writers; the apostles.—§ 16. Time of completion of the canon.—§ 17. Apocryphal writings and pseudepigrapha.—§ 18. Clemens Romanus.—§ 19. Writings falsely ascribed to him. § 20. Ignatius of Antioch.—§ 21. Polycarp, Barnabas, Hermas.—§ 22. Character of the apostolic fathers.

§ 1. As it was the design of our Savior, to gather a church from among all nations, and one which should continue through all ages, the nature of the case required him, first to appoint *extraordinary teachers*; who should be his *ambassadors* to mankind, and every where collect societies of christians; and then, that he should cause to be placed in these societies *ordinary teachers*, and interpreters of his will, who should repeat and enforce the doctrines taught by the extraordinary teachers, and keep the people steadfast in their faith and practice. For any religion will gradually be corrupted, and become extinct, unless there are persons continually at hand, who shall explain and inculcate it.

§ 2. The *extraordinary* teachers, whom *Christ* employed in setting up his kingdom, were those intimate friends of his whom the scriptures denominate *apostles*; and those *seventy disciples*, of whom mention was made above. To these, I apprehend must be added those who are called *evangelists*; that is, as I suppose, those who were either sent forth to instruct the people by the apostles, or who of their own accord, forsaking other employments assumed the office of promulgating the truths which *Christ* taught.(1) And to these, we must further add those, to whom in the infancy of the church, God imparted ability to speak in foreign languages which they had never learned. For he on whom the divine goodness conferred the *gift of tongues*, ought in my judgment, to infer from this gift, that God designed to employ *his* ministry in propagating the christian religion.(2)

(1) Ephes. iv. 11. See *Eusebius*, Hist. eccles. Lib. III c. 37.

(2) 1 Corinth. xiv. 22 &c.

§ 3. Many have undertaken to write the history of the *apostles*; a history full of fables, doubts and difficulties, if we pursue it farther than the books of the N. Test. and the most ancient ecclesiastical writers can guide us.(3) An apostle was a man who was *divinely instructed*; and who was invested with the power of *making laws*, of *punishing the guilty and wicked*, when there was occasion, and of *working miracles* when they were necessary; and who was *sent by Christ himself*, to make known to mankind the divine pleasure and the way of salvation, and to separate those who obeyed the divine commands from all others, and to unite them in the bonds of a religious society.(4)

§ 4. Our knowledge of the *seventy disciples* of Christ, is still more imperfect than that of the apostles; for they are but once mentioned in the N. Test. Luke x. 1. Catalogues of them, indeed, are extant; but these being fabricated by the Greeks in the middle ages, have little or no authority or credibility. Their mission was, as appears from the words used by *Luke*, solely to the Jewish nation. Yet it is very probable, that after the Savior's ascension to heaven, they performed the duties of *evangelists*; and taught in various countries, the way of salvation which they had learned from *Christ*.(5)

§ 5. As to the external *form* of the church and the mode of governing it, neither *Christ* himself nor his apostles gave any express precepts. We are therefore to understand, that this matter is left chiefly to be regulated as circumstances from time to time may require, and as the discretion of civil and ecclesiastical rulers shall judge expedient.(6.) If however, what no christian can doubt,

(3) Writers of the lives of the apostles, are enumerated by *Casp Sagittarius*, Introduction ad Historiam eccles. Cap. I. p. 2. and by *J. Fr. Buddeus*, de Ecclesia Apostolica, p. 673 &c. [Some notices of their lives are given above, in notes (8) and (9) p. 55—57. Tr.]

(4) See *Fred. Spanheim*, de Apostolis et Apostolatu, tom. II. Opp. p. 289 &c. In ascribing *legislative powers* to the apostles, I have proceeded considerably, and as I think, on good grounds. I am aware that eminent men at this day, deny them this power; but perhaps they differ from me, more in words than in reality. [Dr. *Mosheim* founded his opinion on Matth. x. 20. John xiii. 20. Luke x. 16. 1 Tim. iii. 1. 1 Cor. xi. 1—4, 34. and Titus i. 5. See his Instit. hist. Christ. majores, p. 158, &c. Schl.]

(5) Catalogues of the seventy disciples are extant, subjoined to the Libri III. de vita et morte Mosis, elucidated by *Gilbert Gaulmin*; and again published by *J. A. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Græca, p. 474. [See an account of these catalogues in note (5) pa. 51. above. Tr.]

(6) ["Those who imagine that *Christ* himself, or the apostles by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed *form of church government*, are not agreed, what that form was. The *principal opinions* that have been adopted upon this head, may be reduced to the *four* following. The *first* is, that of the *Roman Catholics*, who maintain that Christ's intention and appointment was, that his followers should be collected into *one sacred empire*, subjected to the government of *St. Peter and his successors*, and divided like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, *Peter* fixed the seat of ecclesias-

the apostles of *Jesus Christ* acted by divine command and guidance, then that form of the primitive churches, which was derived from the church of Jerusalem erected and organized by the apostles themselves, must be accounted *divine*; yet it will not follow that this form of the church was to be perpetual, and unalterable.—In those primitive times, each christian church was composed of the *people*, the *presiding officers*, and the *assistants or deacons*. (7) These must be the component parts of every soci-

tical dominion at *Rome*, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three greater provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each, who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at *Rome*, the Asiatic at *Antioch*, and the African at *Alexandria*; that the *bishops* of each province, among whom there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs, and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the *Roman Pontiff*. See *Leo Allatius*, de perpetua consensu. Eccles. Orient. et Occident. Lib. I. cap. II. and *Morin*, Exercitat. ecclesiast. Lib. I. Exerc. I. This romantic account, scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The *second* opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a *supreme head*, or of *patriarchs* constituted by divine authority; but it supposes, that the apostles divided the Roman empire into as many *ecclesiastical provinces* as there were secular or civil ones; that the *metropolitan bishop*, i. e. the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province; and that the *other bishops* were subject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted, by some of the most learned of the Romish church; (*Petrus de Marca*, De concord. sacerdot. et imperii, Lib. vi. cap. I. *Morin*, Exerc. Eccles. Lib. I. Exerc. xviii. and *Pagi*, Critica in Annal. Baronii, ad ann. 37. tom. I. p. 29.) and has also been favored, by some of the most eminent British divines; (*Hammond*, Diss. de Episcop. Beverege, Cod. Canon. vet. Eccles. vindic. Lib. II. cap. v. tom. II. Patr. Apostol. and *Usher*, de origine Episcop. et Metropol. p. 20.) Some Protestant writers of note have endeavored to prove, that it is not supported by sufficient evidence; (*Basnage*, Hist. de l'Eglise, tom. I. Livr. I. cap. 8. *Boehmer*, Annot. ad Petrum de Marca de concordia sacerdot. et imperii, p. 143.)—The *third* opinion is that of those who acknowledge, that when the christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and arch-bishops were indeed created, but only by *human* appointment and authority; though they confess at the same time, that it is *consonant to the orders and intentions of Christ* and his apostles, that there should be, in every christian church, one person invested with the highest authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges, above the other doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world; and also, by many in other countries and communions.—The *fourth* and last opinion, is that of the *presbyterians*, who affirm that *Christ's* intention was, that the christian doctors and ministers should all enjoy the same rank and authority; without any sort of pre-eminence or subordination, or any distinction of rights and privileges.—The reader will find an ample account of these *four* different opinions with respect to church government, in *Dr. Mosheim's* larger history of the first century."

"The truth of the matter is, that *Christ*, by leaving this matter *undetermined*, has, of consequence, left christian societies a *discretionary power*, of modelling the government of the church in such a manner, as the circumstantial reasons, of times, places, &c. may require; and therefore, the *wisest* government of the church, is the *best* and the *most divine*; and every christian society has a *right* to make laws for itself; provided, that these laws are consistent with charity and peace, and with the fundamental doctrines and principles of christianity." *MacL.*

(7) [*Eusebius*, (Demonstratio Evang. L. vii. c. 2.) omits the *deacons*, unless :

ety. The highest authority was in the *people*, or the whole body of christians; for even the apostles themselves inculcated by their example, that nothing of any moment was to be done or determined on, but with the knowledge and consent of the brotherhood. Acts; i. 15. vi. 3. xv. 4. xxi. 22. And this mode of proceeding, both prudence and necessity required, in those early times.

§ 6. The assembled people, therefore, elected their own rulers and teachers, or by their authoritative consent received them, when nominated to them. They also by their suffrages rejected or confirmed the laws, that were proposed by their rulers, in their assemblies; they excluded profligate and lapsed brethren, and restored them; they decided the controversies and disputes that arose; they heard and determined the causes of presbyters and deacons; in a word, the people did every thing, that is proper for those in whom the *supreme power* of the community is vested. All these rights, the people paid for, by supplying the funds necessary for the support of the teachers, the deacons and the poor, the public exigencies, and unforeseen emergencies. These funds consisted of voluntary contributions in every species of goods, made by individuals according to their ability, at their public meetings; and hence were called *oblations*.

§ 7. Among all members of the church of whatever class or condition, there was the most perfect equality; which they manifested by their love-feasts, by their use of the appellatives *brethren* and *sisters*, and in other ways. Nor in this first age of the church, was there any distinction between the initiated and the candidates for initiation. For whoever professed to regard *Jesus Christ* as the Savior of the world, and to depend on him alone for salvation, was immediately baptized, and admitted into the church. But in process of time, as the churches became enlarged, it was deemed advisable and necessary, to distribute the people into two classes, the *faithful* and the *catechumens*. The former were, such as had been solemnly admitted into the church by baptism; and who might be present at all the parts of religious worship, and enjoy the right of voting in the meetings of the church. The latter, not having yet received baptism, were not admitted to [all] the common prayers, nor to the sacred supper, nor to the meetings of the church.

§ 8. The rulers of the church were denominated, sometimes *presbyters* or *elders*; a designation borrowed from the Jews, and indicative rather of the wisdom than the age of the persons; and sometimes, also, *bishops*; for it is most manifest, that *both terms*

he includes them among the rulers; for he divides a church into ἡγούμενος, πιστοὺς, and κατηχουμένους, *the rulers, the faithful and catechumens*. Schl.]

are promiscuously used in the N. Testament of one and the same class of persons. Acts xx. 17, 28. Phil. i. 1. Tit. i. 5, 7. 1 Tim. iii. 1. These were men of gravity, and distinguished for their reputation, influence, and sanctity. 1 Tim. III. 1. &c. Tit. i. 5. &c. From the words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. v. 17. it has been inferred, that some elders *instructed* the people, while others served the church in other ways. But this distinction between *teaching* and *ruling elders*, if it ever existed, (which I will neither affirm nor deny,) was certainly not of long continuance; for St. Paul makes it a qualification, requisite in *all* presbyters or bishops, that they be *able to teach* and instruct others. 1 Tim. iii. 2. &c.(8)

§ 9. As there were but few among the first professors of christianity, who were learned men, and competent to instruct the rude and uninformed on religious subjects, it became necessary that God should raise up in various churches extraordinary teachers, who could discourse to the people on religious subjects in their public assemblies, and address them in the name of God. Such were the persons, who in the N. Testament are called *prophets*. Rom. xii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 28. xiv. 3, 29. Ephes. iv. 11. The functions of these men are limited too much, by those who make it to have been their sole business, to expound the O. Testament scriptures, and especially the prophetic books.(9) Whoever professed to be such a herald of God, was allowed publicly to address the people; but there were present among the hearers divinely constituted judges, who could by infallible criteria discriminate between true and false prophets. The order of prophets ceased, when the necessity for them was past.

§ 10. That the church had its public servants or *deacons*, from its first foundation, there can be no doubt; since no association can exist without its servants; and least of all, can such associations as the first christian churches, be without them. Those *young men*, who carried out the corpses of *Ananias* and his wife, were undoubtedly the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, who were attending on the apostles and executing their commands. Acts v. 6. 10.(11) These first deacons of that church were chosen

(8) See, concerning the word *presbyter*, *Camp. Vitringa*, de Synagoga veteris, Lib. III. p. I. cap. I. p. 609. and *J. Bened. Carpzov*, Exercit. in epist. ad Hebraeos ex Philone, p. 499. On the thing itself, or rather the *persons* designated by this title, see *J. Fr. Buddeus*, Ecclesia Apostol. cap. vi. p. 719. and *Christoph. Matt. Pfaff*, de Originibus Juris eccles., p. 49.

(9) See *Mosheim's* Diss. de illis, qui prophetae vocantur in N. T. [in the 2d. vol. of his Diss. ad Hist. Eccl. pertinentes, p. 125, &c. also *Witsius*, Miscell. Sacra. tom. I. *Koppe*, Excurs. III. in Epistolam ad Ephes. and *Schleusner*, Lexicon in N. Test. art. προφήτης, no. 10. Tr.]

(11) Those who may be surprised, that I should consider the *young men* who

from among the Jewish christians born in Palestine; and as they appeared to act with partiality in the distribution of alms among the native and foreign Jewish christians, seven other deacons were chosen by order of the apostles, out of that part of the church at Jerusalem which was composed of strangers, or Jews of foreign birth. Acts vi. 1 &c. Six of these new deacons were foreign Jews, as appears from their names; the other *one* was from among the *proselytes*; for there was a number of proselytes among the first christians of Jerusalem, and it was suitable that *they* should be attended to as well as the foreign Jews.—The example of the church of Jerusalem, was followed by all the other churches, in obedience to the injunctions of the apostles; and of course, *they* likewise appointed *deacons*. 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9. There were also, in many churches, and especially in those of Asia, female public servants, or *deaconesses*; who were respectable matrons or widows, appointed to take care of the poor, and to perform several other offices. (12)

interred the bodies of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, to be the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, are desired to consider, that the words νεώτεροι and νεανίσκοι, *young men*, are not always indicative of *age*; but often, both among the Greeks and Latins, indicate a *function* or *office*. For the same change is made in these words, as in the word *presbyter*; which every one knows, is indicative, sometimes of *age*, and sometimes merely of *office*. As therefore, the word *presbyter* often denotes the rulers or head men of a society or association, without any regard to their age; so also the terms *young men*, and *the younger*, not unfrequently denote the *servants*, or *those that stand in waiting*; because ordinarily men in the vigor of life perform this office. Nor is this use of the word foreign from the N. Testament. The Savior himself seems to use the word νεώτερος in this sense, Lu. xxii. 26. ὁ μισζων ἐν ὑμῖν, γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος. The word μισζων, he himself explains by ἡγεύμενος, so that it is equivalent to *ruler* or *presbyter*: and instead of νεώτερος, he in the next clause uses ὁ διακονῶν, which places our interpretation beyond all controversy. So that μισζων and νεώτερος are not, here, indicative of certain ages, but of certain offices; and the precept of *Christ* amounts to this: "Let not him that performs the office of a presbyter or elder among you, think himself superior to the public servants or deacons."—Still more evident, is the passage 1 Peter v. 5. ὡμοίως νεώτεροι ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις. It is manifest from what goes before, that *presbyter* here, is indicative of rank or office, denoting *teacher* or *ruler* in the church: therefore its counterpart, νεώτερος, has the same import; and does not denote persons young in years, but the servants or *deacons* of the church. *Peter*, after solemnly exhorting the *presbyters* not to abuse the power committed to them, turns to the *deacons*, and says: "And likewise ye younger, i. e. ye *deacons*, despise not the orders of the presbyters, but perform cheerfully whatever they require of you."—In this same sense, the term is used by *Luke*. Acts v. 6. 10. where νεώτεροι or νεανίσκοι are the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, the very persons whom, a little after, the Hellenists accused before the apostles of not distributing properly the contributions for the poor. I might confirm this sense of the term *young men*, by numerous citations from Greek and Latin writers, both sacred and profane; but this is not the place for such demonstrations.

(12) For an account of the *deacons* and *deaconesses* of the ancient churches, see *Casp. Ziegler*, de diaconis et diaconissis, Wittemb. 1678. 4to. *Sam. Bas-*

§ 11. In this manner, christians managed ecclesiastical affairs so long as their congregations were small, or not very numerous. Three or four presbyters, men of gravity and holiness, placed over those little societies, could easily proceed with harmony, and needed no head or president. But when the churches became larger, and the number of presbyters and deacons, as well as the amount of duties to be performed, was increased; it became necessary, that the council of presbyters should have a *president*; a man of distinguished gravity and prudence, who should distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and be as it were the central point of the whole society. He was, at first, denominated *the angel*; (Apocal. ii. and iii.)(13) but afterwards, *the bishop*; a title of Grecian derivation, and indicative of his principal business. It would seem, that the church of *Jerusalem* when grown very numerous, after the dispersion of the apostles among foreign nations; was the *first* to elect such a president; and that other churches, in process of time, followed the example.(14)

§ 12. But whoever supposes that the bishops of the first and golden age of the church, corresponded with the bishops of the following centuries, must blend and confound characters that are very different. For in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a *single* church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its *lord*, but was in reality its *minister* or servant; he instructed the people, conducted all parts of public worship, and attended on the sick and the necessitous, in person; and what he was unable thus to perform, he committed to the care of the presbyters; but without power to ordain or determine any thing, except with the concurrence of the presbyters and the brotherhood.(15) The emoluments of this singularly laborious and perilous office, were very small. For the churches

nage, Annales polit. eccles. ad ann. 35. tom. i. p. 450. Jos. Bingham, Origines Ecclesiast. Book II. ch. 20. [and Mosheim, de Rebus Christ. ante Constan. M. p. 118 &c. where he defends, at great length, his somewhat peculiar views, respecting the *seven deacons* of the church at Jerusalem.]

(13) [The title of *angel* occurs only in the Apocalypse, a highly poetic book. It was not, probably, the *common* title of the presiding presbyter; and certainly, was not an *older* title than that of *bishop*, which is so often used by St. Paul in his epistles, which were written long before the Apocalypse. See Schlegel's note here. Tr.]

(14) [Dr. Mosheim, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M. p. 134, has a long note in which he argues from the traditional accounts of a longer catalogue of bishops in the church of Jerusalem, than in any other church, during the first ages, that the church of Jerusalem must be supposed to have had bishops *earlier* than any other. Tr.]

(15) [All that is here stated, may be clearly proved from the records of the first centuries; and has been proved, by Jos. Bingham, Origines Ecclesiast. W. Bexerege, Codex Canon. primit. ecclesie, and others. Mosheim, de Reb. Chr. &c. p. 136.]

had no revenues, except the voluntary contributions of the people, or the *oblations*; which, moderate as they doubtless were, were divided among the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons, and the poor of the church.

§ 13. It was not long however, before the extent of episcopal jurisdiction and power was enlarged. For the bishops who lived in the cities, either by their own labors or by those of their presbyters, gathered new churches in the neighboring villages and hamlets; and these churches continuing under the protection and care of the bishops by whose ministry or procurement they received christianity, ecclesiastical provinces were gradually formed, which the Greeks afterwards denominated *dioceses*. The persons to whom the city bishops committed the government and instruction of these village and rural churches, were called *rural bishops*, or *chorepiscopi*, [*τῆς χῶρας ἐπισκοποὶ*, *episcopi rurales*, seu *villani*,] i. e. bishops of the suburbs and fields. They were an intermediate class, between the bishops and the presbyters; being inferior to the former, [because subject to them,] and superior to the latter, [because entrusted with discretionary and perpetual power, and performing nearly all the functions of bishops.](16)

§ 14. All the churches, in those primitive times, were *independent* bodies; or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the apostles themselves, frequently had the honor shown them, to be consulted in difficult and doubtful cases; yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is clear as the noon day, that all christian churches had *equal rights*, and were in all respects on a footing of equality. Nor does there appear in this first century, any vestige of that *consociation* of the churches of the same province, which gave rise to *ecclesiastical councils*, and to *metropolitans*. Rather, as is manifest, it was not till the *second* century, that the custom of holding ecclesiastical councils began, first in Greece, and thence extended into other provinces.(17)

(16) [Learned men, who have written largely on the subject, have debated whether the *chorepiscopi* ranked with *bishops*, or with *presbyters*. See *J. Morin*, de Sacris eccles. ordinat. Pt. I. Exere. iv. *D. Blondel*, de Episc. et Presbyt. sec. iii. *W. Bererege*, Pandect. Canon. tom. ii. p. 176. *C. Ziegler*, de Episcopis L. i. c. 13. p. 105 &c. *Peter de Marca*, de Concordia sacerdot. et imperii, L. ii. cap. 13, 14. *Böhmer*, Adnott. ad Petrum de Marca, p. 62, 63. *L. Thomassin*, Disciplina eccles. vet. et nova, P. I. L. ii. c. 1. p. 215.—But they did not belong, entirely, to either of those orders. *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante Const. M. p. 137.]

(17) It is commonly said, that the meeting of the church in Jerusalem, which is described Acts xv. was the *first christian council*. But this is a perversion of the import of the term *council*. For that meeting was a conference of only a single church, called together for deliberation: and if such meetings may be called *ecclesiastical councils*, a multitude of them were held in those primitive times.

§ 15. Among the christian doctors and ecclesiastical writers, the first rank is most clearly due to the *apostles* themselves, and to certain disciples of the apostles, whom God moved to write histories of the transactions of *Christ* and his apostles. The writings of these men are collected into one volume, and are in the hands of all who profess to be christians. In regard to the history of these sacred books, (18) and the arguments by which their divine authority and their genuineness are evinced, (19) those authors are to be consulted who have written professedly on these subjects.

§ 16. As to the time *when* and the persons *by whom* the books of the New Testament were collected into one body or volume, there are various opinions, or rather conjectures of the learned: for the subject is attended with great and almost inexplicable difficulties, to us of these latter times. (20) It must suffice us to know, that before the middle of the *second* century, most of the books composing the New Testament, were in every christian church, throughout the known world; and were read, and regarded as the divine rule of faith and practice. And hence it may be concluded, that it was, while some of the apostles were still living, and certainly while their disciples and immediate successors were every where to be met with, that these books were separated and distinguished from all human compositions. (21) That the *four Gospels* were combined, during the life time of the apostle *John*; and that the three first Gospels received the approbation of this inspired man, we learn expressly, from the testimony of *Eusebius*. (22) And why may we not suppose, that the other books of the New Testament were collected into one body, at the same time?

§ 17 There were various causes, requiring this to be done at an early period; and particularly this, that not long after the Savior's ascension, various histories of his life and doctrines, full

An ecclesiastical *council* is a meeting of *delegates* from a number of *confederate churches*.

(18) See, on this subject, *J. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliotheca Græca*, L. iv. c. V. p. 122—227, [and *Jer. Jones*, *Method of settling the canonical authority of the N. T.* 3 vol. 8vo. and the modern *Introductions to the books of the N. T.* in English, by *G. Horne*, and *J. D. Michaels*, ed. *Marsh*; and in German, by *Haenlin*, *Krug*, *Bertholdt*, *Eichhorn*, &c. *Tr.*]

(19) The [early] writers in defence of the divine authority of the N. T. are enumerated by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Delectus argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptor. pro verit. relig. Christianae*. cap. 26. p. 502. [On the subject itself, the modern writers are numerous, and generally known. *Lardner* and *Paley* still hold the first rank among the English. *Tr.*]

(20) See *Jo. Ens*, *Biblioth. Sacra, seu diatriba de Libror. N. T. canone*, Amstel. 1710. 8vo. and *Jo. Mills*, *Prolegom. ad N. T.* Sec. I. p. 23 &c.

(21) See *Jo. Frick*, *de Cura veteris ecclesiæ circa canon.* cap. III. p. 86 &c.

(22) *Euseb.* *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. III. cap. 24.

of impositions and fables, were composed, by persons of no bad intentions perhaps, but who were superstitious, simple; and piously fraudulent; and afterwards, various spurious writings were palmed upon the world, inscribed with the names of the holy apostles. (23) These worthless productions would have worked

(23) Such as remain of these spurious works, have been carefully collected, by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Codex Apocryphus N. Test.* 2 vol. 12mo. pp. 2006. *Hamb.* 2d ed. 1719. Many learned remarks on them, occur in *Is. de Beausobre*. *Histoire critique des dogmes de Manichée*, Liv. II. p. 337, &c. [For the information of those, who have not access to these spurious books, the following remarks are introduced:—No one of all the books contained in the *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* of *Fabricius*, speaks disrespectfully of *Christ*, of his religion, his apostles and followers, or of the canonical books of the N. T. They were evidently composed with a design; to subserve the cause of christianity. They aim to supply deficiencies in the true Gospels and Acts, or to extend the history, by means of oral traditions and supplementary accounts, professedly composed by apostles, or apostolic men. At least, this is true of those books which bear the title of Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. These were all designed, either *first*, to gratify the laudable curiosity of christians, and subserve the cause of piety; or, *secondly*, to put to silence the enemies of christianity, whether Jews or pagans, by demonstrating, from alleged facts and testimony, that *Jesus* was the Messiah, his doctrines divine, his apostles inspired, &c. or, *lastly*, to display the ingenuity of the writer, and to gratify the fancy by a harmless fiction. The only parts of this collection, which do not seem to me to fall under one or the other of these classes, are such as by mistake, have been ascribed to the apostles and evangelists: such as the Liturgies, Creed, and Canons, which go under their names. Of those which are lost, no judgment can be formed but by testimony. Perhaps, some of them were composed, with hostile views towards the canonical scriptures.—The following account of the contents of the *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* may not be unacceptable or useless to many. On opening the first volume, we meet with (1) “The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary,” Latin, in 10 sections, p. 19—33.—(2) “The Previous Gospel, (Protevangelium,) ascribed to *James* the Just, the brother of our Lord,” Gr. and Lat. in 25 sect. p. 66—125.—(3) “The Gospel of the Infancy of Christ; ascribed to *Thomas* the apostle,” Gr. and Lat. in 7 sect. p. 156—167.—(4) “The Gospel of the Infancy, translated from the Arabic, by *Henry Sikes*,” Latin, in 55 sect. p. 168—211. It is the aim of all these to supply deficiencies in the beginning of the true Gospels, by acquainting us more fully with the history of the virgin *Mary*, *Joseph*, *Elizabeth*, &c. and with the birth, infancy and childhood of *Christ*.—Next follow (5) “The Gospel of *Nicodemus*,” or, as it is sometimes called, “The Acts of *Pilate*,” relating to the crucifixion and resurrection of *Christ*, Latin, in 27 sect. p. 233—258.—(6) Three “Epistles of *Pilate* to *Tiberius* the emperor,” giving account of the condemnation; death, and resurrection of *Christ*; Latin, about 2 pages.—(7) “The Epistle of *Lentulus* to the Roman senate,” describing the person and manners of *Christ*, Latin, one page.—The three last, (No. 5, 6, 7,) were intended to be valuable appendages to the true Gospels, and to contain irrefragable proofs, that *Jesus* was the Messiah, and clothed with divine authority.—Then follow, the writings ascribed to *Christ* himself; viz. his correspondence with *Abgarus*, king of Edessa; which is to be found in *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 13. and in various modern works. These letters seem to have higher claims to authenticity, than any other pieces in this collection; and yet few, if any, of the judicious, will now admit them to be genuine.—*Fabricius* next gives a catalogue of about forty apocryphal Gospels, or of all the spurious Gospels, of which the slightest notice can be found in antiquity. These are all, of course now lost, or buried in the rubbish of old libraries; except the few which are contained in the previous list.—Vol. I. Pt. II. begins with “The apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, or the history of their conflicts; ascribed to *Abdias*, the first bishop of Babylonia, Libri x. Latin, p. 402—742. This history summarily recounts, what the canonical books relate of each of the 12 apo-

great confusion, and would have rendered both the history and the religion of Christ uncertain, had not the rulers of churches seasonably interposed, and caused the books which were truly divine and which came from apostolic hands, to be speedily separated from that mass of trash, into a volume by themselves.

§ 18. Next after the apostles, *Clement*, the bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation, as one of the writers of this century. The accounts we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are, for the most part, uncertain.(24) There are still extant, *two epistles to the Corinthians*, bearing his name and written

cles, and then follows them severally through their various travels and labors, till their death or martyrdom. It was probably compiled in the middle ages, (it is first mentioned by *James*, a bishop of Geneva, in the 13th century,) and by a monk, who was well acquainted with the ancient legendary tales, and who had good intentions; but who nevertheless was incompetent to distinguish what was true, from what was false.—Then follows a catalogue of all the ancient biographies of individual apostles and apostolic men, which *Fabricius* could hear of; in all, 36 in number. Many of these were professedly compiled, several centuries after the apostles were dead, and all of them that still remain, are mere legends, of little or no value. Most of those that have been published, are to be met with in the Martyrologies and in the *Acta Sanctorum*.—*Fabricius* next gives us apocryphal *Epistles*, ascribed to the virgin *Mary*, to *Paul*, and to *Peter*.—*Mary's* letters are but *three*, and those very short. One is addressed to St. *Ignatius*, in 9 lines; another, to the people of Marseilles, in 11 lines; and the third, to the people of Florence, in 4 lines.—To St. *Paul*, is attributed a short Epistle to the *Laodicæans*, Gr. and Lat. It is a tolerable compilation from his genuine epistles.—Then follows a gentlemanly but vapid correspondence, in Latin; said to have passed between St. *Paul* and *Seneca*, the Roman philosopher. It comprises 14 short letters, full of compliments and of very little else.—*Paul's* third Epistle to the *Corinthians*, has not had the honor to be published.—There is one epistle of the apostle *Peter*, addressed to the apostle *James*, still extant, in the *Clementina*, or spurious works of *Clemens Romanus*.—Of spurious *Revelations*, *Fabricius* enumerates *twelve*; most of which are either lost, or have not been judged worth publishing. The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the ivth. book of *Esdras*, are the two best known, and the most valuable.—The II. Vol. of the *Codex* opens, with the ancient *Liturgies*, going under the names of the apostles and evangelists. They are *six*; viz. those which bear the names of St. *James*, St. *Peter*, St. *John*, St. *Matthew*, and St. *Luke*; together with a short prayer, ascribed to St. *John*. These *Liturgies*, doubtless, are quite ancient. We may believe them to have been actually used by different churches, which supposed they were in accordance with the instructions of their favorite apostles.—To these *Liturgies*, are subjoined *nine* Canons or ecclesiastical laws, said to have been adopted in a council of the apostles, held at Antioch; and finally, the Apostles' Creed, which many of the ancients supposed, was formed by the apostles themselves.—The Appendix to the *Codex* gleans up some fragments and additional notices of the pieces before mentioned, and then closes with the *Shepherd of Hermas*, accompanied with notes. Tr.]

(24) Subsequent to *Tillemont* [*Memoirs pour servir à l'histoire de l'église*, tome II. P. I. p. 279,] *Cotelier* [*Patres Apostol.*] and *Grabe*, [*Spicileg. Patrum sæc. I. p. 264, &c.*] *Philip Rondininus* has collected all that is known of this great man, in the first of his two Books, de S. Clemente, Papa et martyre, ejusque Basilica in urbe Roma, Rome 1706. 4to. [See also *Bowers' Lives of the Popes*, vol. I. p. 14—20. ed. 2d. *Clemens* was, perhaps, the person mentioned by *Paul*, Philip. iv. 3. He was one of the most distinguished Roman christians, became bishop of Rome towards the close of the century, and is said to have lived till the third year of *Trajan's* reign, or about AD. 100. Tr.]

in Greek; of these, it is generally supposed, that the first is genuine, and that the second is falsely palmed upon the holy man by some deceiver.(25) Yet even the first epistle seems to have been corrupted by some indiscreet person, who was sorry to see no more marks of erudition and genius in a production of so great a man.(26)

§ 19. The other works which bear the name of *Clement*, namely, *the apostolic Canons*, *the apostolic Constitutions*, *the Recognitions of Clement*, and *the Clementina*;(27) were fraudulently ascribed to this eminent father, by some deceiver, for the purpose of procuring them greater authority. This, all now concede. *The apostolic Canons* are *LXXXV. ecclesiastical Laws*; and exhibit the principles of discipline received in the Greek and oriental churches, in the second and third centuries. *The VIII. Books of apostolical Constitutions*, are the work of some austere and melancholy author, who designed to reform the worship and discipline of the church, which he thought were fallen from their original purity and sanctity, and who ventured to prefix the names of the apostles to his precepts and regulations, in order to give them currency.(28) *The Recognitions of Cle-*

(25) The editions of *Clement's* epistles to the Corinthians, are mentioned by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Græca Lib. iv. c. 5. p. 175 &c.* to which must be added, the edition of *Hen. Wotton*, Cantab. 1718. 8vo. which is preferable to the preceding editions, in many respects. [The English reader may find them both, together with some account of this author, in abp. *Wake's* genuine epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, translated &c. An ample account of them is given by *N. Lardner*, *Credibility of the Gosp. history*, Pt. II. vol. I. p. 283. ed. Lond. 1815. Tr.]

(26) See *J. B. Cotelier*, *Patres Apostolici*, tom. I. p. 133, 134. and *Edw. Bernhard*, *Adnotatiunculæ ad Clementem*, in the last edition of the *Patres Apostol.* by *J. le Clerc*. These annotations *H. Wotton* has in vain attempted to confute, in his notes on the epistle of *Clement* — [Besides the two epistles to the Corinthians, there are extant, in Syriac, two other epistles, ascribed to *Clement*, entitled *de Virginitate, seu ad Virgines*. They were first brought to Europe by Sir *James Porter*, British ambassador at Constantinople; and were published, with a Latin translation accompanying the Syriac text, by *J. J. Wetstein*, at the end of the 2d vol. of his very learned *Gr. N. Testament*, Lugd. Bat. 1752. Dr. *N. Lardner* assailed their genuineness, in a Diss. of 60 pages, 8vo. Lond. 1753. and *Herm. Venema* followed, in three printed letters 1754. *Wetstein* replied to the former; but dying in March 1754, he left the controversy with the latter, to *Andrew Galand*, who prosecuted it in his *Bibliotheca vet. Patrum*, Dissert. II. cap. II. also in *Sprenger's Thesaurus rei Patrist.* tom. I. p. 60, &c. These epistles are not mentioned by any writer, till near the end of the fourth century. They were probably composed, in the oriental church, at the close of the second, or in the third century; and for the double purpose, of recommending celibacy, and reprehending the abuses of such a life. See *A. Neander's Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I. Pt. III. p. 1103 &c. Tr.]

(27) For the history and various editions of these works, see *Thom. Ittig*, Diss. de *Patribus Apostol.* prefixed to his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostol.* and his Diss. de *Pseudepigraphis Apostol.* annexed to his *Appendix ad Librum de Haeresiarchis ævi Apostol.*—also *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Græca*, L. v. cap. I. p. 31 &c. and L. vi. cap. I. p. 4 &c. [The best edition, is that of *Cotelier*, republished by *Le Clerc*, 2 vol. Fol. Amstel. 1724. Tr.]

(28) The various opinions of the learned, respecting the *apostolic Canons* and

ment, which differ but little from the *Clementina*, are ingenious and pretty fables ; composed by some Alexandrine Jewish christian and philosopher, of the *third* century, to meet the attacks of the Jews, Gnostics, and philosophers upon the christian religion, in a new manner. A careful perusal of them, will assist a person much, in gaining a knowledge of the state of the ancient christian church.(29)

§ 20. The *Apostolic Fathers* as they are called, are those christian writers who were conversant either with the apostles themselves, or with their immediate disciples. Among these, the next after *Clement* was *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, a disciple and companion of the apostles. He suffered martyrdom under *Trajan*; being exposed to wild beasts, in the theatre at Rome.(30)

Constitutions, are collected by *J. F. Buddeus*, Isagoge in Theologiam, Pt. II. cap. v. p. 746. [See *Bp. Beveridge*, Notes on these Canons, and his Codex Canonum eccles. prim. vindic. et illustratus, Lond. 1678. 4to.—The *Canons* themselves make a part of the Corpus Juris Canonici, and are also inserted in *Binius*' and other large Histories of the Councils. They are valuable documents, respecting the order and discipline of the church, about the *third* century. The *apostolic Constitutions* seem to have undergone changes since their first formation, and probably by Arian hands in the *fourth* century. They are voluminous and minute regulations, respecting ecclesiastical discipline and worship. They are of considerable use, in determining various points of practice in the church, during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. Tr.]

(29) See *Mosheim's* Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia, in the first vol. of his Dissertt. ad Historiam Eccl. pertinentes, § 34. p. 174 &c. [The *Apostolic Canons* and *Constitutions* were ascribed to *Clement* as the collector and publisher only. The *Recognitions*, *Clementina* &c. are ascribed to him as the author.—The writings belonging to this latter class, are three different works on the same subject, and written after the same general plan. They all doubtless had one and the same author, who re-wrote his own work, for the sake of giving it a better form. The substance of them all, is, *Clement's* history of his own dissatisfaction with paganism; his first and slight knowledge of christianity, which induced him to journey from Rome to Palestine; there he met with *Peter*, and for some time resided and traveled with him, heard his public discourses, and witnessed his combats particularly with *Simon Magus*; and in private conversations with the apostles, every thing pertaining not only to christianity, but to cosmogony, physics, pneumatology, &c. was fully explained to him. The three works often relate precisely the same things, and in the same words; but they not unfrequently differ in the fulness of the details, and in many of the minor points both of doctrine and of fact. The first is entitled *Sti Clementis Romani Recognitiones*. The original is lost; so that we have only the Latin translation of *Rufinus*. It is divided into 10 Books, and fills 111 large folio pages. The second is the *Clementina* (α Κλημεντινα,) first published Gr. and Lat. by *Cotelier*. It fills 146 folio pages. It commences with an epistle of *Peter*, and another of *Clement*, addressed to the apostle *James*. The body of the work, instead of being divided into Books and Chapters, like the *Recognitions*, is thrown into 19 discourses, or homilies, (ὁμιλίας), as delivered by *Peter*, but committed to writing by *Clement*. The third is the *Clementine Epitome*, or abridged account of the acts, travels, and discourses of *Peter*, together with the epistle of *Clement* to *James*, Gr. and Lat. pp 52. fol. This is, as its title implies, a mere abridgment of the two preceding works. Tr.]

(30) See *Seb. de Tillemont*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tom. II. P. II. p. 42. 80.

There are extant several epistles bearing his name ; and concerning which the learned have had long and sharp contests. The seven, written while he was on his way to Rome, as published AD. 1646, by *J. Vossius*, from a Florentine M. S. are, by most writers, accounted genuine ; but the others, they reject as forged. To this opinion, I cheerfully accede ; and yet I must acknowledge, that the genuineness of the *epistle to Polycarp*, on account of its difference in style, appears to me very dubious ; and indeed the whole subject of the Ignatian epistles in general, is involved in much obscurity and perplexity. (31)

§ 21. *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom at an extreme age, in the middle of the second century. The epistle addressed to the Philippians, which is ascribed to him, is by some accounted genuine, and by others spurious : which of these

(31) In regard to these epistles, consult *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Græca*, Lib. V. cap. I. p. 38—47. [*Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* III. 36. makes very honorable mention of *Ignatius* and his epistles ; and describes his conduct while on his way to Rome the place of his martyrdom. The account of his martyrdom which is printed along with his epistles, gives a still fuller account of this eminent father. It is clear that he suffered death in the reign of *Trajan* ; but whether AD. 107 or 116 is uncertain. Rome was the place of his martyrdom, and wild beasts his executioners. On his way from Antioch, he was enraptured with his prospect of dying a martyr, and wrote probably, all his epistles. *Eusebius* says : “ He confirmed the churches in every city through which he passed, by discourses and exhortations ; warning them most especially, to take heed of the heresies, which then first sprung up and increased.”—From Smyrna, (according to *Eusebius*,) he wrote *four* of his epistles ; viz. to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Trallis and Rome. The last of these was, to intreat the Roman christians not to interpose and prevent his martyrdom. From Troas, he wrote *three* other epistles ; viz. to the churches of Philadelphia and of Smyrna, and to his friend *Polycarp*. Of these *seven* epistles, there are duplicate copies still extant ; that is, copies of a larger and of a smaller size. The latter are those which many suppose to be genuine. Besides these, there are extant *five* other Greek epistles, and as many more in Latin ; which are now universally rejected : viz. *ad Mariam Cassibolitam*, *ad Tarsenses*, *ad Antiochenos*, *ad Heronem Antiochenum Diaconem*, *ad Phillippenses* ; also one in Latin, from the Virgin *Mary* to *Ignatius*, and his reply ; two from *Ignatius* to *St. John* ; and one of *Maria Cassibolita* to *Ignatius*.—It is the singular fortune of the seven first epistles of *Ignatius*, to have become the subject of *sectarian* controversy among Protestants. In these epistles, the dignity and authority of *bishops* are exalted higher than in any other writings of this age. Hence, the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of episcopacy, prize and defend these epistles with no ordinary interest ; while the Reformed divines, and especially those of Holland, France and Switzerland, assail them with equal ardor. The most prominent champions are bishop *Pearson*, in his *Vindicia epistolarum Ignatii*, Cantabr. 1672. 4to. and *John Daille*, *de Scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur*, Genevae 1666. 4to. But each of these is supported by a host of able polemics. The truth is, that the *external* evidence, or that from ancient *testimony*, makes much for the genuineness of these epistles, though equally for the larger as for the smaller. The *internal* evidence is divided ; and of course affords ground for arguments on both sides. Moderate men of various sects, and especially Lutherans, are disposed to admit the genuineness of the epistles in their shorter form ; but to regard them as *interpolated* and altered. An English translation of them and of the martyrdom of *Ignatius*, may be seen in archbishop *Wak*’s genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers. Tr.]

are in the right, it is difficult to determine.(32) The *Epistle of Barnabas* as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish christian who lived in this century, who had no bad intentions, but possessed little genius and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different person from *Barnabas*, the companion of *St. Paul*.(33) The book entitled the *Shepherd of Hermas*, (so called, because an angel, in the form and habit of a shepherd, is the leading character in the drama,) was composed in the second century by *Hermas*, the brother of *Pius* the Roman bishop.(34) The writer, if he was indeed sane, deemed it proper to forge dialogues held with God and angels, in order to insinuate what he regarded as salutary truths, more effectually, into the minds of his readers. But his celestial spirits talk more insipidly, than our scavengers and porters.(35)

§ 22. All these writers of this first age of the church possessed little learning, genius, or eloquence; but in their simple and unpolished manner, they express elevated piety.(36) And this is

(32) Concerning *Polycarp* and his epistle, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom II. P. II. p. 257, and *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.* Lib. V. cap. I. p. 47. [Also *W. Care*, *Life of Polycarp*, in his *Apostolici; or Lives of the Primitive Fathers*. Lond. 1677. Fol. The epistle of *Polycarp*, (the genuineness of which, if not certain, is highly probable,) and the epistle of the church of *Smyrna*, concerning the martyrdom of *Polycarp*, (which none now call in question,) are given in English, in archbishop *Wake's* *Genuine Epistles, &c.* Tr.]

(33) Concerning *Barnabas*, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires, &c.* tome I. P. III. p. 1043. *Thom. Ittig*, *Select. historiae eccles. capita*. Sec. I. cap. I. § 14. p. 20. and *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.* Lib. iv. cap. v. § 14. p. 173. and Lib. v. cap. I. § 4. p. 3. and various others. [This ancient monument of the christian church, is likewise translated by archbishop *Wake*, *Genuine Epistles, &c.* Tr.]

(34) This is now manifest from the very ancient *Fragment of a treatise on the canon of the holy scriptures*, published a few years ago by *Lud. Antony Muratori*, (from an ancient M. S. found at Milan,) in his *Antiq. Italicar. medii. ævi*. tom. III. Diss. XLIII. p. 853 &c. [But the genuineness and authority of this treatise itself, are now very much questioned by the learned; so that the true author of the *Shepherd of Hermas* is still unknown. Tr.]

(35) For the best edition of *Hermas*, we are indebted to *J. A. Fabricius*, who subjoined it to the third vol. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* He also treats of this writer, in his *Biblioth. Graeca*, L. v. cap. ix. § 9. p. 7. See also *Tho. Ittig*, de *Patribus Apostolicis*, § 55. p. 184 &c. [and in his *Select. historiae eccles. capita*. § 1. p. 65 and 155—179. The *Shepherd of Hermas* is translated by archbishop *Wake*, *Genuine Epistles, &c.* and though wild and fanciful, yet from the pious spirit which it breathes, and the insight it gives us, into the speculations of the early christians, it is not a useless book. Tr.]

(36) The writers above named, are denominated the *Apostolic Fathers*; and they are often published together. The best editions are by *J. Bapt. Cotelier*, Paris, 1672. re-edited by *J. le Clerc*, Antw. 1698, and again amsterd. 1724. 2 vol. Fol. with numerous notes by both the editors and others. [This last and best edition, Gr. and Lat. contains all that has been ascribed to the *Apostolic Fathers*, whether truly or falsely. The portions which archbishop *Wake* regarded as genuine, he translated and published with a preliminary discourse of 136 pages. 2d ed. Lond. 1710. 8vo.—The value of the genuine works of these fathers, to learned theology very small; but as affording us acquaintance with the

honorable, rather than reproachful to the christian cause. For, that a large part of the human race should have been converted to *Christ*, by illiterate and imbecile men, shews that the propagation of christianity must be ascribed, not to human abilities and eloquence, but to a divine power.

true spirit and sentiments and reasonings of christians in the very first age after the apostles, they are of inestimable value.—If any one wishes to know, what was the *simplicity and godly sincerity* of that first and infantile age of the church, let him read the Apostolic Fathers. *Tr.]*

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND RELIGION.

§ 1. The nature and the standard of the christian religion.—§ 2. Interpretation of the scriptures.—§ 3. Mode of teaching christianity.—§ 4. The Apostles' Creed.—§ 5. Distinction between catechumens and the faithful.—§ 6. Mode of instructing catechumens.—§ 7. Instruction of children; schools and academies.—§ 8. Secret doctrine.—§ 9. Lives and characters of christians.—§ 10. Excommunication.—§ 11. Controversies among christians.—§ 12. Contest about the terms of salvation.—§ 13. Judaizing christians.

§ 1. The whole of the christian religion is comprehended in two parts; the one of which teaches, *what we are to believe* in regard to religious subjects; and the other, *how we ought to live*. The former is, by the apostles, denominated *the mystery* (μυστήριον) or *the truth* (ἀλήθεια) and the latter, *godliness* or *piety* (εὐσέβεια.); 1 Tim. iii. 9. vi. 3. Tit. i. 1. The rule and standard of both are, those books, which God dictated to certain individuals, either before or after the birth of *Christ*. These books, it has long been the custom, to denominate *the Old and the New Testaments*.

§ 2. Provision therefore was early made, both by the apostles and their disciples, that these books should be in the hands of all christians; that they should be publicly read in their assemblies; and be applied both to enlighten their minds with truth, and to advance them in piety. Those who expounded the scriptures, studied simplicity and plainness. Yet it is not to be denied, that even in this century the perverse Jewish custom of obscuring the plain language of scripture by forced and frigid allegories, and of diverting words from their natural and proper meaning in order to extort from them some recondite sense, found some admirers and imitators among christians. Besides others, *Barnabas*, whose epistle is still extant, is proof of this.

§ 3. The manner of teaching religious truths was perfectly simple, and remote from all the rules of the philosophers, and all the precepts of human art. This is manifest, not only from the epistles of the apostles, but from all the monuments of this century which have come down to us. Nor did any apostle or any one of their immediate disciples, collect and arrange the principal doctrines of christianity, in a scientific or regular *system*. The circumstances of the times, did not require this; and the followers of *Christ* were more solicitous to exhibit the religion they had embraced, by their tempers and their conduct, than to explain its principles scientifically, and arrange them according to the precepts of art.

§ 4. There is indeed extant, a brief summary of christian doctrines, which is called the *Apostle's Creed*; and which, from the fourth century onward, was attributed to *Christ's* ambassadors themselves. But at this day, all who have any knowledge of antiquity, confess unanimously, that this opinion is a mistake, and has no foundation.(1) Those judge far more wisely and rationally, who think that this creed arose from small beginnings, and was gradually enlarged, as occasions required, in order to exclude new errors from the church.(2)

(1) See *J. Fr. Buddens*, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, L. II. c. ii. § 2. p. 441. and *J. G. Walch*, *Introduct. in libros symbolicos*, L. I. cap. ii. p. 87 &c.

(2) This is shown, with no less learning than ingenuity, by *Peter King*, *History of the Apostles' Creed*; which *G. Olearius* translated into Latin, and published Lips. 1704. 8vo. But those who read this book, should be apprised, that the noble author often gives us conjectures instead of arguments; and that his conjectures do not always deserve to be implicitly received.—[Although the *Apostles' Creed* was not composed in a council of apostles, as was supposed in the days of *Rufinus*, (*Ruf. de Symbola*; subjoined to *Cypriani Opera*.) yet it appears to have been the *general Creed of the christian church*, from, at least, the close of the *second* century, down to the reformation. Nor did it undergo any very great or material change; as appears from comparing the formulas of faith given by *Irenæus* AD. 175. (*adv. Hæret.* i. 10. and iii. 4.) and by *Tertullian*, AD. 192. (*de Virgin. veland.* cap. i.—*contra Praxeam*, cap. ii.—*Præscriptt. adv. Hæret.* cap. xiii.) with the forms of the Creed, in all subsequent writers, down to the present time. See these forms, collected by *C. G. F. Walch*, in his *Bibliotheca symbolica vetus*, Lemgo, 1770. 8vo. Yet there were *some* variations in its form, as used by different churches; and *additions* were made to it, from time to time.—Besides serving as the general test of christian orthodoxy, the principal use of this creed, in the *third* and following centuries, was, to guide catechists, in training and instructing the catechumens in the principles of christianity. See *Cyril of Jerusalem*, (*Catechesis*, passim,) *Rufinus* (*de Symbola*.) and *Augustine*. (*Sermo I. ad Catechum. Opp. tom. vi. p. 301—405. ed. Benedict.*)—It is a most valuable monument of the church; because it shows, what in the early ages, were considered as the great, the peculiar, and the essential doctrines of the gospel; viz. those all important *facts*, which are summarily recounted in this Creed. The common form of it in the *fourth* century, as used in most churches in Europe, Asia, and Africa, except some slight verbal discrepancies, was the following.

In Greek, Πισευω εις Θεον (πατέρα) παντοκρατορα. και εις Χριστον Ιησυν, υιον αυτου τον μονογενη (μονογεννητην), τον κυριον ημων, τον γεννηθεντα εκ πνευματος αγιου και Μαρίας της παρθενου, τον επι Ποντιου Πιλατου σταυρωθεντα. (και) ταφεντα, (και) τη τριτη ημερα ανασαντα εκ (των) νεκρων, αναθαντα εις τεσσαραν, (και) καθημενον εν δεξια πατρος, οθεν ερχεται κριναι (κρινειν) ζωντας και νεκρους. και εις (το) αγιον πνευμα, αγιας εκκλησιαν, αφεσιν αμαρτιων, εαρχος αναστην.

In Latin. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum filium ejus, Dominum nostrum: qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine; crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; ascendit in celos, sedet ad dextram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum: sanctam ecclesiam; remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem.

In English. I believe in God, the Father, almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten son, our Lord, who was born of the virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, buried, arose from the dead on the third day, ascended to the heavens, and sits on the right hand of the Father; whence he

§ 5. At the first promulgation of the gospel, *all* who professed firmly to believe, that *Jesus* was the only redeemer of mankind, and who promised to lead a holy life, conformably to the religion he taught, were received immediately among the disciples of *Christ*: nor did a more full instruction in the principles of christianity, *precede their baptism*; but followed after it. But afterwards, when churches were every where established and organized, for very just reasons, this custom was changed; and none were admitted to the sacred font, unless previously well instructed in the primary truths of religion, and affording indubitable evidence of a sincere and holy character. And hence arose the distinction between *catechumens*, or such as were in a course of instruction and discipline under the care of certain persons, and the *faithful*, who were admitted to all the mysteries, having been initiated and consecrated by baptism.(3)

§ 6. The instruction given to the catechumens was different, according to their genius and capacity. For those of feeble minds, were instructed only in the more general and fundamental principles of religion: while those, who appeared capable of grasping and comprehending all christian knowledge, were instructed in every thing that could render a christian stable, and perfect according to the views of that age. The business of instructing those of superior capacity and genius, was committed to men of gravity and erudition, in the larger churches. Hence the ancient doctors generally divide their flocks into two classes of persons, the one comprising such as received solid and thorough instruction, the other embracing the more ignorant. Nor do they conceal the fact, that different modes of teaching were adopted in reference to these two classes.(4)

will come, to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit; the holy church; the remission of sins; and the resurrection of the body.

A few centuries later, it attained in the Romish church its ampler form, in which it has since been adopted by most protestant churches: as follows.—“I believe in God, the Father, almighty, maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into hell, the third day he arose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father, almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.”

Besides those mentioned by *Mosheim*, the principal writers on this Creed, are *Cyril*, *Rufinus* and *Augustine*, as above; and *G. J. Vossius*, (*de Tribus Symbolis*, Opp. tom. vi. p. 507 &c.) *abp. Usher* (*de Rom. Eccles. alijsq; Fidei Symbolis*) *Bp. Pearson* (on the Creed,) *C. Suicer*, (*Thesaur. Eccles. voce Σύμβολον*), and *J. Bingham*, *Antiq. Eccl. Lib. x. Tr.*]

(3) [See *J. Bingham*, *Orig. Eccles. Lib. iii. cap. iv.* and *Tob. Pfanner*, *de Catechuminis veterum*. Vinarie 1688. 12mo. *Tr.*]

(4) See *Origen*, *adv. Celsum*, *Lib. iii. p. 143.* The apostles themselves seem

§ 7. There is no doubt, but that the children of christians were carefully trained up from their infancy, and were early put to reading the sacred books and learning the principles of religion. For this purpose, *schools* were erected every where, from the beginning. From these schools for children, we must distinguish those *seminaries* of the early christians, erected extensively in the larger cities, at which adults and especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed and educated, in all branches of learning both human and divine. Such seminaries, in which young men devoted to the sacred office, were taught whatever was necessary to qualify them properly for it, the apostles of *Christ* undoubtedly both set up themselves, and directed others to set up. 2 Tim. ii. 2. St. *John* at Ephesus, and *Polycarp* at Smyrna, established such schools.(5) Among these seminaries, in subsequent times, none was more celebrated than that at *Alexandria*; which is commonly called a *catechetical school*, and was said to be erected by St. *Mark*.(6)

§ 8. What many tell us, that the ancient christians had their *popular* and their *secret* doctrines, and did not communicate to all classes, the same instructions; may be admitted as true, if it be rightly explained. For, those whom they would induce to em-

to have been the authors of this practice, of which we have vestiges, 1 Cor. iii. 2. Heb. v. 12. *Schl.*]

(5) *Irenaeus*, adv. Hær. L. II. c. 22. p. 148, ed. Massuet. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. c. 20.—[The proofs referred to here and in the text, are quite insufficient to evince, that in the *first* century, or even in the former part of the *second*, christians established *regular schools* for their children, and *academies* for their young men. *Paul's* direction to *Timothy* (2 Epis. ii. 2.) "The things thou hast heard of me,—the same *commit thou to faithful men*, who shall be able to teach others also;" seems to have no distinct reference to a *regular public school*, either for boys or for *young men*. And the passages in *Irenaeus* and *Eusebius* referred to, speak only of the *general instruction* and advantages, which the neighboring *clergy* and others derived from the apostle *John*; and of the interesting *conversations* of *Polycarp*. Considering the poverty and embarrassments of the first christians, we can hardly suppose, they *could* have erected such schools and academies. And from the great penury of writers, and of learned men of any sort, in the early church,—*Justin Martyr*, a converted philosopher in the middle of the second century, being the first learned writer, after the apostles;—it seems most probable, that till past the middle of the *second* century, the means of education among christians were very slender; and by no means so general and so ample, as Dr. *Mosheim* supposes. *Tr.*]

(6.) See *J. A. Schmidt*, Diss. de schola catechet. Alexandr. prefixed to the tract of *A. Hyperius*, de Catechesi; also *Dom. Aulisius*, delle Scuole sacre, Lib. ii. c. i, ii. p. 5—17. and c. xxi. p. 92 &c. Concerning the larger schools of christians in the East, at Edessa, Nisibis, Seleucia; and concerning the ancient christian schools, in general; see *J. S. Asseman*, Biblioth. orient. Clem. Vat. tom. iii. P. II. p. 914—919.—[The ancient tradition, preserved by *Jerome* (de Scriptor. Illustr. cap. 36.) that *St. Mark* was the founder of the catechetical school at Alexandria, deserves but little credit; since all antiquity is silent respecting a christian school there, or any teacher, or student, in it, till the days of *Pantænus*, and his pupil *Clemens Alex.* near the close of the *second* century. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. iii. p. 188 &c. *Tr.*]

brace *Christ*, were not introduced at once to the high mysteries of religion which exceed the grasp of the human mind, but were first instructed in the doctrines which reason can comprehend, till they were able to bear the more sublime and difficult truths. And afterwards, those who ranked among believers were not all instructed in the same manner; but one was directed to study and treasure up in his mind more, or fewer things, than another. Whoever would understand more than this, by the *secret doctrine* of the first century, should beware, lest he confound the faults of subsequent ages with the excellences of this.(7)

§ 9. Most authors represent the lives and morals of christians in this age, as patterns of purity and holiness, worthy of the imitation of all subsequent ages. This representation, if it be understood of the *greater part* of the professed christians, and not of *all*, is undoubtedly true. But whoever supposes the primitive churches were perfectly free from all vices and sins, and estimates the lives of *all* the christians by the conduct of some of them and by the precepts and exhortations of their teachers, as most of those writers have done, whose books and tracts concerning the innocence and holiness of the early christians are extant; may be confuted by the clearest evidence of both testimony and facts.(8)

§ 10. The visible purity of the churches was much promoted, by that law which deprived of ordinances and excluded from the community persons of vile character, or who were known to be vicious; provided they would not reform on being admonished. Such a law, we know was established by the apostles, soon after churches began to be formed.(9) In the application and enforcement of this law, the teachers and rulers generally pointed out the persons who seemed to merit exclusion from the church, and the

(7) Concerning this *secret doctrine*, much is collected by *Chr. Matt. Pfaff*, Diss. posterior de Præjudiciis Theolog. § 13. p. 149 &c. in his *Primitia Tubingensia*.

(8) [For a knowledge of the state of piety and morals among the christians of the first century, we are dependent nearly altogether on the holy scriptures: for all the apostolic fathers, except *Clement*, lived and wrote in the *second* century. Besides, their writings state very few facts, and acquaint us with almost nothing, except what relates to the views and feelings of the writers themselves. *Clement* wrote upon occasion of a broil in the church of Corinth; and he aims to set home *Paul's* exhortations to them on former occasions. From the N. T. and especially from *Paul's* epistles, we learn many things respecting the state of morals and piety among christians, from the first planting of the churches till about AD. 68. And from the Apocalyptical epistles, we learn the state of religion in the seven churches of Asia, about AD. 96. Judging from these representations, it would seem that the characters of the christians of that age, presented a singular combination of excellencies and defects; that in some respects, they were indeed patterns for all after ages; but in other respects, and especially certain churches, as Corinth, Galatia, Sardis, and Laodicea, by no means deserved imitation. Tr.]

(9) [See 1 Cor. v.] For the discussions that have taken place respecting this law, see *Chr. Matt. Pfaff*, de Originibus Juris Ecclesiast. p. 10—13, 71, 78.

people sanctioned or rejected the proposal at their discretion. Excluded sinners, although they had committed the very highest offences, if they gave satisfactory evidence of penitence for their faults, and of their leading better lives in future, were allowed to return to the church, at least in most places ; yet but once only. For those who were restored, if they returned to their former bad practices, and were again excluded from the brotherhood, had no more a prospect of forgiveness.(10)

§ 11. As the christian churches were composed of both Jews and gentiles, between whom there had been an inveterate aversion ; and as these recent christians retained many erroneous impressions, received and cherished from their infancy, it could not be but that various disagreements and contests would early arise among them. The first of these contests related to the necessity of observing the law of *Moses*. It broke out in the church of Antioch ; and its issue is stated by *Luke*, Acts xv. This controversy was followed by many others ; partly with Jewish christians, too much attached to their national religion ; partly with persons captivated with a species of fanatical philosophy ; and partly with some who abused the christian doctrines, which they ill understood, to the gratification of their appetites and lusts.(11) *St. Paul* and the other apostles, often mention these controversies, but so cursorily and concisely, that we can hardly ascertain the exact points controverted.

§ 12. Of all these contests, the greatest and most important was, that relating to the way of attaining to justification and salvation, which Jewish teachers excited at Rome and in other christian churches. For while the apostles every where inculcated, that all hopes of justification and salvation should be placed solely on *Jesus Christ* and his merits ; these Jewish teachers ascribed to the law and to the works which *Christ* enjoined, the chief influence in procuring everlasting happiness. This error not only led on to many others, which were prejudicial to the religion of *Christ*, but was connected with the highest dishonor to the Savior. For they who maintained that a life regulated according to the law, would give a title to eternal rewards, could not hold

(10) See *Jo. Morin*, Commentar. de disciplina pœnitentiæ, Lib. ix. cap. 19. p. 670. and others. [*Natal. Alexander*, Hist. Eccles. N. T. sæc. III. Diss. VII. and *J. Aug. Orsi*, Dis. qua ostenditur, cathol. ecclesiam tribus prior. sæculis capital. erim. reis pacem et absolut. neutiquam denegasse. Milan, 1730. 4to. But all these writers describe rather the practice of the second and third centuries than that of the first. *Tr.*]

(11) Conducive to the illustration of these controversies, are the investigations of *Herm. Witsius*, Miscellanea Sacra, tom. II. Exerc. xx, xxi, xxii. p. 668, &c. *Camp. Vitringa*, Observatt. sacræ. Lib. IV. c. ix, x, xi. p. 952. [*J. F. Buddeus*, Ecclesia Apostolica ; and especially *Ch. W. Fr. Walch*, Volständige Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen, u. s. f. vol. I. p. 68, &c. also the Commentators on the scriptures. *Tr.*]

Christ to be the Son of God, and the Savior of mankind ; but merely a Prophet, or a divine messenger among men. It cannot therefore appear at all strange, that *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the Romans and elsewhere, took so much pains to extirpate this capital error.

§ 13. The controversy respecting the necessity of the Mosaic rites in order to salvation, was wisely decided by the apostles, Acts xv. But great as the apostolic influence was, that deep rooted love of the Mosaic law which was handed down from their fathers, could not be wholly eradicated from the minds of the Jewish christians, and especially of those living in Palestine. It diminished a little, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the prostration of the temple by the Romans ; yet it did not wholly subside. Hence it was, as we shall see hereafter, that a part of the Jewish christians separated from the other brethren, and formed a distinct sect attached to the law of *Moses*.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Baptism and the Lord's supper appointed by Christ.—§ 2. Rites instituted by the apostles.—§ 3. The Jewish rites retained.—§ 4. Public assemblies of christians, and times for meeting.—§ 5. Places of meeting.—§ 6. Mode of worship.—§ 7. Lord's supper and agapac.—§ 8. Baptism.—§ 9. Anointing the sick.—§ 10. Fasting.

§ 1. Although the christian religion has the greatest simplicity, and requires nothing but faith and love; yet it could not wholly dispense with external rites and institutions. Jesus himself established but *two* rites, which it is not lawful either to change or to abrogate; viz. *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*. Yet these are not to be considered as mere ceremonies, or as having only a symbolical import; but as having also a sanctifying influence on the mind. That he chose to establish no more rites, ought to convince us, that ceremonies are not essential to the religion of *Christ*; and that the whole business of them, is left by him to the discretion and free choice of christians.

§ 2. Many considerations leave us no reason to doubt, that the friends and apostles of the Savior, sanctioned in various places the use of other rites; which they either tolerated from necessity, or recommended for good and solid reasons. Yet we are not to suppose that they have any where inculcated an established and permanent system of clerical rights and prerogatives; nor that they prescribed the same rites and forms in all churches. On the contrary, various things go to shew, that christian worship was from the beginning regulated and conducted differently, in different places; and this, no doubt, with the approbation of the apostles and their coadjutors and disciples; and that in this whole matter, much regard was shewn to the former opinions, customs and laws of different nations.(1)

(1) [It appears that even so late as the third and fourth centuries, there was considerable difference in the mode of conducting religious worship among christians. See *Irenæus*, quoted by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. V. cap. 24. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. VII. cap. 19. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. V. cap. 22. *Augustine*, Epist. 54. Opp. tom. II. p. 93. A part of this difference in rites and ceremonies, appears to have come down from the apostolic times. For when a contest arose in the second century, between the oriental and the occidental christians, respecting the day on which Easter should be observed; we are informed by *Eusebius*, (Hist. Eccl. L. V. cap. 23, 24.) that the former maintained, that *John* was the author of their custom; and the latter, that *Peter* and *Paul* were the authors of theirs. Both churches were probably correct: for it is very probable that *John*, for certain reasons, did ordain in Asia, that the feast of Easter should be kept at

§ 3. I am therefore induced to dissent from those who think, that the Jewish rites and forms were, *every where*, transferred by the apostles and their disciples to the christian assemblies. In those churches indeed, which were composed either wholly or principally of Jews, I can easily believe, the Jewish rites were so far retained, as the different characters of the two religions would permit. And this may be evinced by a good many examples. But that the same took place in other churches, in which either no Jews, or only a few were found; is not merely uncertain, but incredible. Because it was proper that the rituals of those early times should be variously modeled, according to the peculiarities of genius and character in different nations.

§ 4. As there was diversity in the practice of christians, it will be very difficult to make statements, relative to their mode of worship and other customs and regulations, which will be equally applicable to *all* the countries in which christianity flourished. Yet there are a few regulations, which may be considered as common to all christians; and of these, we shall give a brief account.—The christians of this century, assembled for the worship of God, and for their advancement in piety, on the *first day of the week*, the day on which *Christ* reassumed his life: for that this day was set apart for religious worship, by the apostles themselves, and that, after the example of the church of Jerusalem, it was generally observed; we have unexceptionable testimony. (2) Moreover, those congregations, which either lived intermingled with Jews, or were composed in great measure of Jews, were accustomed also to observe the *seventh day* of the week, as a sacred day: (3) for doing which, the other christians taxed them

the time the Jews kept it; and that *Peter* and *Paul* ordered otherwise at Rome. Further, the Greek and Latin churches had a contest on the question, whether *leavened* or *unleavened* bread should be used in the sacred supper. And both churches claimed to have their customs handed down to them from the apostles; and for the reasons before mentioned, both were probably in the right.—Even the Catholics often admit this diversity of ceremonies in the apostolic church; e. g. *Jo. Bona*, Rerum Liturg. L. I. c. 7. § 2. Opp. p. 208. and the Jesuit *Jo. Harduin*, makes no scruple to assert, that *Paul* enjoined on the Greeks *one* form for the consecration of priests; and *Peter*, on the Romans another. His book is entitled: *La dissertation du P. le Courayer sur la succession des Evesques Anglois et sur la validité de leur ordination, réfutée.* tom. II. p. 13. Paris, 1725. 8vo. [add *A. Krazer*, de Apostolicis, nec non antiquis eccl. occident. Liturgiis. Sect. I. cap. I. § 2 p. 3. ed. Augustæ Vind. 1786.] See *Mosheim's* Institut. majores hist. Christ. p. 375. Schl.]

(2) *Ph. J. Hartmann*, de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis, cap. xv. p. 387. *J. Hen. Böhmer*, Diss. I. Juris eccles. antiqui de stato die Christianor. p. 20 &c. [See also, Acts xx. 7. ii. 1. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Apoc. i. 10. *Pliny*, Epist. Lib. x. Ep. 97. n. 7. Schl.]

(3) *Steph. Curcellæus*, Diatriba de esu sanguinis; Opp. Theol. p. 958. *Gabr. Albaspinæus*, Observatt. Eccles. Lib. I. Obs. xiii. p. 53. In vain, some learned men labor to persuade us, that in *all* the early churches, *both* days, or the *first* and *last* days of the week, were held sacred. The churches of Bithynia, men-

with no wrong.—As to *annual* religious days, they appear to have observed *two*; the one, in memory of *Christ's* resurrection; the other, in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles.(4) To these may be added, those days on which holy men met death for *Christ's* sake; which, it is most probable, were sacred and solemn days, from the very commencement of the christian church.(5)

§ 5. The *places* of assembling were, undoubtedly, the private dwelling houses of christians. But as necessity required, that when a congregation was formed and duly regulated, some fixed, uniform place for its meetings should be designated; and as some furniture was requisite for their accommodation, such as books, tables and benches, which could not conveniently be transported from place to place, especially in those perilous times; it was undoubtedly the case, that the place of their assemblies soon became, instead of a private room, a sort of public one.(6) These few remarks, I conceive, are sufficient to determine that long controversy, *whether the early christians had temples or not?*(7) If the word *temple* may denote a *dwelling house*, or even a part of one, which is devoted to the public exercises of religion, yet without any idea of holiness attached to it, and which is not separated from all profane or secular uses; then I can readily admit, that the earliest christians had temples.

§ 6. In these public assemblies of christians, the holy scriptures were read; which, for that purpose, were divided into portions or lessons. Then followed an exhortation to the people,

tioned by *Pliny*. devoted but *one stated day* to their public worship: and beyond all controversy, that was, what we call the *Lord's day*, or the first day of the week.

(4) Although some have doubted, whether the day called *Pentecost*, (*Whitsunday*), was a sacred day, so early as the first century: (see *J. Bingham*, *Origines Eccles. Lib. xx. cap. 6.*—) yet I am induced, by very weighty reasons, to believe that, from the beginning, it was held equally sacred with the *Passover*, (or *Easter day*). Perhaps also (*Good Friday*) the *Friday* on which our Saviour died, was from the earliest times regarded with more respect than other days of the week. See *J. Godefroi*, in *Codicem Theodos. tom. I. p. 138.* *Asseman*, *Biblioth. orient. Vatican. tom. I. p. 217, 237.* *Martene*, *Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. V. p. 66.*

(5) [These were called *natalitia martyrum* (the *martyr's birth days*). See *Casp. Sagittarius*, de *Natalitiis martyrum*, republished by *Crenius*, *Syntagma I. Diss. philol. 1699.* In the *second* century, these *natalitia* were every where observed; and they are often mentioned by *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*. Nay, in the epistle of the church of Smyrna to Philomelius, in *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 15.* the observance of the day of *Polycarp's* martyrdom, is spoken of. *Schl.*]

(6) See *Camp. Vitranga*, de *Synagoga vetere*, *L. I. P. III. cap. 1. p. 432.* [It may be inferred from *Acts xix. 8.* *1 Cor. xi. 22.* *xiv. 35.* and *Ja. ii. 2.* that christians, then, had certain determinate places for holding public worship. *Schl.*]

(7) See *Dav. Blondell*, de *Episcopis et Presbyt. Sect. III. p. 216, 243, 246.* *Just. Hen. Böhmer*, *Diss. II. Juris eccles. antiq. de Antelucanis Christianorum coetibus*, § *iv. p. 39.* *Jos. Bingham*, *Origines Eccles. Lib. viii. ch. I. and others.*

neither eloquent nor long, but full of warmth and love. If any signified that they were moved by a divine afflatus, they were allowed successively to state what the Lord commanded; the other *prophets* who were present, judging how much authority was due to them. 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Afterwards, the prayers which constituted no inconsiderable part of public worship, were recited after the bishop.(8) To these succeeded hymns; which were sung, not by the whole assembly, but by certain persons, during the celebration of the sacred supper and the feasts of charity. The precise order and manner of performing all these parts of religious worship, in the various christian churches, cannot be fully ascertained; yet it is most probable, that no one of these exercises was wholly omitted in any church.(9)

§ 7. The prayers of christians were followed, by *oblations* of bread, wine, and other things, for the support of the ministers of the church and the poor. For, every christian who had any thing to spare, brought his gift, and offered it in a sense to the Lord.(10) From these gifts, so much bread and wine as were requisite for the Lord's supper, were set apart, and consecrated by prayer, offered by the bishop alone, to which the people responded *amen*.(11) The distributors of the sacred supper, were the *deacons*. To this most holy ordinance were annexed, what, from their design, were denominated *agapae*, feasts of charity.(12) The various difficulties which occur in the accounts respecting these feasts, will, undoubtedly, be solved with ease, by admitting that the earliest christians were governed by different rules, and did not every where, celebrate either this or other institutions in the same manner.

§ 8. In this century *baptism* was administered, in convenient places, without the public assemblies; and by immersing the candidates wholly in water.(13) At first, all who were engaged in propagating christianity, administered this rite: nor can it be called in question, that whoever persuaded any person to embrace

(8) See *Justin Martyr*, *Apologia secunda*, p. 98 &c.

(9) This must be understood of the churches that were fully established and regulated. For in the nascent churches, which had not become duely regulated, I can believe, one or other of these exercises might be omitted.

(10) See *Christ Matt. Pfaff*, *Dissertt. de oblatione et consecratione Eucharistica*; in his *Syntagma Dissertt. Theolog.* Stutgard, 1720, 8vo.

(11) *Justin Martyr*, *Apologia Secunda*, p. 98 &c. The writers on the ceremonies of the saered supper, are mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, *Bibliograph. antiquariae*, cap. xi. p. 395 &c.

(12) The writers concerning the *agapae*, are mentioned by *Tho. Ittig*, *Select. Histor. Eccles. capita*, Saecul. II. cap. iii. p. 180 &c. and *Christ. Matt. Pfaff*, *de Originibus Juris Eccles.* p. 68.

(13) See *Ger. Jo. Vossius*, *de Baptismo*, Disp. I. Thes. VI. p. 31 &c. and the authors recommended by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* cap. xi. § xxv. p. 389 &c.

christianity, could baptize his own disciple. But when the churches became more regulated, and were provided with rules of order, the *bishop* alone exercised the right of baptizing all the new converts to christianity; though in process of time, as the limits of his church were enlarged, he imparted this right to the *presbyters* and *chorepiscopi*; reserving however the *confirmation* of those baptisms, which were administered by presbyters.(14) As to the ceremonies, which in this early period were superadded to baptism for the sake of order and decency, we are not able to say any thing with certainty; nor do we think it safe to estimate the rules of this age, by the customs of subsequent times.

§ 9. The Grecian christians, when dangerously sick, sent for the elders of the church; agreeably to Ja. v. 14, and after the sick man had confessed his sins, the elders commended him to God in devout supplication, and anointed him with oil. Many things in regard to this rite, may be, and have actually been, subjects of controversy. But the silence of the ancient writers, prevents our coming to any certain conclusions. For though there is no reason to doubt, that this rite prevailed extensively among christians, yet it is rarely mentioned in the writings of the ancients.(15)

§ 10. No law was enacted by *Christ* and his apostles, concerning *fasts*; but the custom obtained, that most christians occasionally and privately, joined abstinence from food with their prayers; and especially when engaged in undertakings of great importance. 1 Cor. vii. 5. How much time a man should spend in this exercise, was left to the private judgment of each individual; nor did a person expose his character at all, if he thought it sufficient for *him* to observe ~~only~~ the rules of strict temperance.(16) Of any solemn *public* fasts, except only on the anniversary day of the crucifixion of *Christ*, there is no mention in the most ancient times. Gradually however, days of

(14) These remarks, I conceive, go to elucidate and determine the questions so strenuously debated among the learned, concerning the *right of administering baptism*. See *Just. Hen. Boehmer*, Diss. xi. *Juris eccles. antiqui*, p. 500 &c. *Jo. Le Clerc* *Biblioth. universelle et historique*, tome iv. p. 93 &c.

(15) Most of the ancient testimonies concerning this custom, are collected by *Jo. Launoi*, de Sacramento unctionis infirmorum, cap. i. p. 444. *Opp. tom. I.* Among these passages, very few are to be found in the writers of the *first* centuries; yet there is here and there one, which has escaped the notice of this very learned man. [The principal writers on this subject, are mentioned by *J. C. Wolf*, *Curæ Philol. et Crit. tom. IV. on Ja. v. 14. Tr.*]

(16) Shepherd of *Hermas*, Lib. III. Similit. v. p. 931, 935. ed. *Fabricii*, at the close of vol. III. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* [The best writer on this subject, is *John Daillé*, de Jeuniis et Quadragesimo, Davent. 1654. 8vo. against whom, however, *Beveridge* brings some objections, in *Codex Canon. vind. Schl.*]

fasting were introduced; first by custom, and afterwards by legal sanction. Whether any thing of this nature occurred in the *first* century, and what days were devoted to fasting, we have not the means of deciding. And yet I would not deny, that very specious arguments are adduced by those who think, that while the apostles were still living, or soon after their decease, the christians in most places abstained from food, either wholly, or partially, on the fourth and on the sixth days of the week.(17)

(17) See *Wil. Beverege*, Codex Canon. vindic. tom. II. Patr. Apostol. p. 166.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Sects sprung up in the very times of the apostles.—§ 2. They gradually increased.—§ 3. Sect of the Gnostics.—§ 4. It originated from the oriental philosophy.—§ 5. They occasioned various errors, in regard to the holy scriptures, and other subjects.—§ 6. Gnostic opinions concerning *Christ*.—§ 7. Their moral doctrines.—§ 8. How they supported their doctrines.—§ 9. Causes of disagreement among themselves.—§ 10. Dositheus.—§ 11. Simon Magus, was not a *heretic*.—§ 12. His history.—§ 13. His doctrines.—§ 14. Menander.—§ 15. Whether there was a sect of Nicolaitans.—§ 16. Cerinthus, and the Cerinthians.—§ 17. Nazareans and Ebionites, properly belong to the 2d century.

§ 1. Christian churches had scarcely been gathered and organized, when here and there, men rose up, who not being contented with the simplicity and purity of that religion which the apostles taught, attempted innovations, and fashioned religion according to their own liking. This appears, from various passages in the epistles left us by the apostles, and particularly from *Paul's* epistles. For in these, there is frequent mention of persons, who either endeavored to mould the christian doctrines into conformity with that philosophy, or γυνώσκεις, (1) to which they were addicted; or who were disposed to combine with christianity, Jewish opinions, customs, and institutions. Several of these corrupters of religion are likewise expressly named; as *Hymenaeus* and *Alexander*, *Philetus*, *Hermogenes*, *Phygellus*, *Demas*, and *Diotrephes*. (2) If, however, from this list, *Alexander*, *Hymenaeus*, and *Philetus* be excepted, the others appear to be, rather, apostates from the *practice* of religion, than corrupters of its *principles*. (3)

(1) 1 Tim. vi. 20. and ch. i. 3, 4. Tit. iii. 9. Colos. ii. 8.

(2) [Concerning *Diotrephes*, there is a particular tract, by *Stemler* 1758. *Schl.*]

(3) 2 Tim. ii. 18, and elsewhere. See also the elaborate discussions concerning these men, by *Camp. Vitringa*, *Observ. Sacrae*, Lib. IV. cap. ix. p. 952. *Thomas Ittig*, de *Haeresiarchis aevi Apostol.* Sect. I. cap. viii. p. 84. *J. Fr. Buddeus*, de *Ecclesia Apostolica*, cap. V. p. 292 &c.—[As to *Hymenaeus* and *Philetus*, we are informed by *St. Paul*, 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, comp. 1 Tim. i. 19, 20, not only in general, that they had swerved from sound doctrine; but their particular error is pointed out. They taught, that a resurrection of the dead was no longer to be anticipated, it being already passed; and they labored to make proselytes to this opinion. See *J. G. Walch*, *Exercitat. de Hymenaeo et Phileto*; in his *Miscell. Sacra*. p. 81 &c.—As to *Alexander*, it is still contested, whether the *Alexander* in 1 Tim. i. 20. and 2 Tim. iv. 14, and Acts ix. 33, be one and the same person. The greater part believe the affirmative. But *Heumann*, (*Expos. of the N. T.* vol. vi. p. 363,) and *Dr. Mosheim*, (*Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 178,) support the negative; being inclined to believe, that there were *two* persons of this name. The younger *Walch* (*Entwurf der Ketzerereyen*, p. 127.) pre

§ 2. So long as the greater part of the apostles were alive, to watch over the churches, these innovators were not very successful, and seem to have had no great number of followers. But gradually, they acquired more influence; and before the decease of all those whom *Christ* had himself instructed, they laid the foundations of those sects, which afterwards exceedingly disturbed the christian community, and gave rise to so many contests. The history of these sects, is very obscure; indeed, the most obscure part of ecclesiastical history. This obscurity arises, partly from the deficiency of ancient records; partly, from the tenets of these sects, which for the most part were singularly caliginous and remote from common apprehension; and partly, from the ignorance and hostility of those who have written concerning them. This however is perfectly clear, that no one who loves the truths which the bible inculcates, can find any thing to commend in the peculiarities of these sects.(4)

§ 3. At the head of all the sects, which disturbed the peace of the church, stand the Gnostics; who claimed ability to restore to mankind the lost knowledge ($\gamma\nu\tilde{\omega}\sigma\iota\varsigma$) of the true and supreme God; and who announced the overthrow of that empire, which the creator of the world and his associates had set up. It is, indeed, the common opinion, and supported by the testimony of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (*Stromat. L. vii. c. 17. p. 898, 899.*) that the Gnostic sects first arose, *after the decease of the apostles*, in the reign of *Adrian*; and that previously, no discords had

fers abiding by the common opinion. *Hermogenes* and *Phygellus*, are accused by Paul, 2 Tim. i. 15. of only having forsaken him, when he was imprisoned at Rome, which was *inconstancy*, but not heresy. As to *Demas*, Paul tells us 2 Tim. iv. 10, that, from love to the world, he had forsaken him. But this gives no ground for charging him with being a heretic.—*Diotrephes*, mentioned in the 3d Ep. of John, is accused of a twofold fault; viz. refusing to receive those, whom the apostle recommended to his kind offices; and, setting himself in opposition to the apostle. But neither of these offences, is sufficient to constitute him a heretic. *Schl.*]

(4) Professed histories of the sects which arose in this and the next century, have been written, by *Thom. Ittig*, de Haeresiarchis aevi Apostolici et Apostolorum proximi, Lips. 1690. 4to. and an Appendix, Lips. 1696. 4to. by *Renatus Mas-suetus*, Dissertt. Irenaeo praemissae; and by *Sebast. le Nain de Tillemont*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise. But all these, and others whom I pass over, have rather collected *materials* for a history of these sects, than written the history itself. Among the Lutherans, *Abr. Hinckelmann*, *Ja. Thomasius*, *Jo. Hen. Horbius*; and among the Reformed, *Ja. Basnage*, and *Henry Dodwell*, have either promised the world such a history, or attempted to write it; but have done no more. We must therefore still wait for some person of adequate sagacity, fairness, and skill in ancient philosophy and literature to accomplish this difficult undertaking. [This has been since attempted, by *C. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf ciner vollständigen Historie der Ketzereyen, &c. 11 vol. 8vo. 1762—85. *N. Lardner*, Hist. of the Heretics, Lond. 1780. 4to. *F. A. Lewald*, de Doctrina Gnostica, Heidelb. 1818. 8vo. *A. Neander*, Genetische Entwicklung d. vornehmsten gnost. Systeme, Berlin, 1818. 8vo. and still better, in his *Algem. Gesch. der chr. Relig. u Kirche*, Vol. I. P II. p. 602—859. Tr.]

produced separations from the church. But the sacred scriptures themselves,—to say nothing of other ancient documents,—put it beyond controversy, that even in the *first* century, in various places, men infected with the Gnostic leprosy began to erect societies distinct from the other christians. 1 Jno. ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8.(5) Yet these stray flocks did not become distinguished for their numbers, or for their fame and notoriety, till the times of *Adrian*. Under the appellation of Gnostics, are included all those in the first ages of the church, who modified the religion of *Christ*, by joining with it the oriental philosophy, in regard to the source of evil, and the origin of this material universe. The leading principles of this philosophy, have already been stated.

§ 4. All those eastern philosophers, believing that rational souls became connected with matter, and inhabitants of bodies, contrary to the will and pleasure of the supreme God, were in expectation of a mighty legate from the Deity, possessed of consummate wisdom and power; who would imbue, with a knowledge of the true God, the spirits now oppressed with the load of their bodies, and rescue them from their bondage to the lords of this material world. When therefore, some of them perceived, that *Jesus* and his friends wrought miracles of a salutary character, they were ready to believe that *Jesus* was that mighty legate of God, come to deliver men from the power of the Genii who governed this lower world, and to rescue souls from their unhappy connexion with material bodies. This supposition being admitted into minds polluted with gross errors, they interpreted or rather perverted *whatever Christ* and his disciples taught, so as to make it harmonize with their *other* opinions.

§ 5. Hence there necessarily arose among them a multitude of opinions, which were extremely foreign from the precepts of *Christ*. Their belief that the world was not created by the supreme God in whom is all perfection, but by one or more inferior deities, of a bad or at least of an imperfect character, would not allow them to admit the divine authority of the O. T. scriptures; and it led some of them, to venerate and extol the *serpent*, the prime author of sin among men, and likewise several of the vilest persons mentioned in the Jewish scriptures. The same belief induced them to condemn *Moses*, and the religion he taught; and to represent him as instigated to impose such hard

(5) [The reader will recollect, that Dr. *Mosheim's* opinions, concerning an oriental philosophy, in the Apostolic age, have been much questioned; (see Note (7) p. 73,) and that these texts which speak only of false *teachers*, who corrupted the truth, afford no certain evidence of the existence of Gnostic *churches* or congregations, existing as distinct religious bodies. Tr.]

and unsuitable laws on the Jews, by the world's creator, who had no regard for human happiness, but only for his own glory and authority. Their belief that *matter* is eternal and the source of all evil, prevented them from putting a due estimate upon the human body; and from favoring marriage, whereby bodies are produced; and also from admitting the doctrine of the future resurrection of the body. Their belief that malevolent genii ruled over the world, and that from them originated all the diseases, wars, and calamities of men; led them, almost universally, to addict themselves to *magic*, or the art of weakening and paralyzing the power of those genii. I omit many other points, as not compatible with so summary a history as this.

§ 6. Their principles required, that while they admitted *Christ* to be the *Son* of the supreme God, and a messenger sent from the *Pleroma* or upper world where God and his family dwell, for the benefit of miserable souls, they should hold most unworthy sentiments concerning his person and offices. They could not admit him to be truly God, nor truly man. Not truly God, because they held him, though begotten of God, to be yet much *inferior* to the Father: nor truly man; because every thing concrete and corporeal, they believed to be intrinsically and essentially *evil*. So that most of them divested *Christ* of a material body, and denied him to have suffered for our sakes, what he is recorded to have endured. The cause of *Christ's* coming among men, they said, was simply to strip the tyrants of this world, those impotent genii, of their power over the virtuous and heaven-born souls of men; and to teach men, how to withdraw their divine minds from these impure bodies, and fit them for a union with God.

§ 7. Their systems of morals, we are informed, were widely different. For most of them recommended abstinence and austerity, and prescribed the most severe bodily mortifications; in order that the soul, whose ill fate it was to be associated with a body, might enjoy greater liberty, and be able the better to contemplate heavenly things. For, the more this depraved and grovelling habitation of the soul is weakened and attenuated, the less will it be able to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of divine objects. But some of them maintained, on the contrary, that we may safely indulge all our libidinous desires; and that there is no moral difference in human actions.(6) This contrariety of opinions need not surprise us: because one and the same principle naturally produced both systems. For persons who believed that their bodies were the very essence of evil, and calculated only to hold their souls in bondage, might, according as they

(6) See *Clemens Alex. Stromat. Lib. iii. cap. v. p. 529.* ed. Potter.

were of a voluptuous or of a morose and austere disposition, either fall into the conclusion, that the acts of the body have no connection with the soul when it has attained to communion with God, or, on the contrary, suppose that the body must be strenuously resisted and opposed, as being the enemy of the soul.

§ 8. As these extraordinary opinions required proof, which it was not easy to find in the writings of the apostles, recourse was had to falsehoods and impositions. Therefore when asked, where they had learned what they so confidently taught; some produced fictitious books, under the names of *Abraham*, *Zoroaster*, and *Christ*, or his apostles; some pretended to have derived their principles from a concealed and secret doctrine taught by *Christ*; some affirmed that they had arrived at this high degree of wisdom, by an innate energy which existed in their own minds; and some pretended that one *Theudas*, a disciple of *St. Paul*, or *Matthias*, one of *Christ's* disciples, had been their teacher. Those of them, who did not wholly reject the books of the New Testament, either interpreted them very absurdly, neglecting the true import of words, or corrupted them most basely, by retrenching what they disliked, and adding what they pleased.

§ 9. It is easy to see, how these persons, after assuming the name of christians, became divided into numerous sects. In the first place, it appears from what has been already stated, that they held very different opinions, before they attended to christianity. Hence, as each one endeavored to accommodate *his own* philosophical opinions to the christian religion, it was the necessary consequence, that various systems of religion were produced. Moreover, some of them were born Jews, as *Cerintus* and others, and did not wish to appear contemners of *Moses*: while others were wholly estranged from the Jewish religion, and could indulge themselves in liberties, which the former could not. And lastly, this whole system of philosophy and religion was destitute of any fixed and solid basis, being the creature of their own fancy; and who does not know, that systems and projects, which are the productions of the imagination, never have uniformity.

§ 10. The heads and leaders of the philosophical sects which troubled the church in the first century, next come to be considered. The first place among them is, by many, given to *Dositheus*, a Samaritan. And it is sufficiently proved, that there was a man of this name among the Samaritans, about the times of our Savior; and that he left a sect behind him. But all the accounts we have of him, clearly show that he is to be ranked, not among those called *heretics*, but among the enemies of the christian name; or, if it be thought more correct, among the delirious and insane. For he wished to be thought to be himself the *Messiah*,

or that Prophet whom God had promised to the Jews : he could not, therefore, have held *Jesus Christ* to be a divine ambassador ; nor have merely corrupted *his* doctrines.(7)

§ 11. What I have said of Dositheus, I would likewise say of *Simon Magus*. This impious man is not to be ranked among those who corrupted christianity by an intermixture of errors, or among the *heretics* ; but is to be classed among those, who declared open war against christianity ; and this notwithstanding nearly all the ancient and modern writers make him to have been the *head*, the *father*, and the *ringleader* of the whole heretical camp. For it is manifest, from all the records we have of him, that after his defection from the christians, he ascribed to *Christ* no honor at all ; but set *himself* in opposition to *Christ*, and claimed to be himself the supreme power of God.(8)

§ 12. What the ancients relate of the life and opinions of *Simon*, are so different and inconsistent, that some very learned men have concluded, they could not all relate to *one* person ; and thus, they would make out *two Simons* ; the one, *Simon Magus*, who abandoned the christian religion ; and the other, a Gnostic *philosopher*. On this point, men will judge as they please ; but to *us* it appears neither safe nor necessary, to reject the testimony of the ancients, that there was only *one* Simon.(9) He was by birth,

(7) *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, L. ii. cap. xiii. p. 307. *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccles. par M. du Pin, tom. iii. cap. xiii. p. 304. [*Mosheim*, Inst. hist. Chr. major. p. 376. C. W. F. *Walch*, Ketzerhistorie. I. p. 182. All the accounts make *Dositheus* to have lived among the Samaritans ; one writer represents him, as an apostate Jew. According to *Origen* (Philocal. I.) he was a rigorous observer of the law of *Moses* ; and particularly, allowed no one to move from the spot where the sabbath overtook him. According to *Epiphanius* (Hæres. Lib. i. Pt. I. hæ. 13. previous to the christian heresies) he was an apostate Jew, whose ambition being disappointed, he retired among the Samaritans, lived in a cave, and fasted so rigorously as to occasion his death. Other ancient accounts simply mention him among the founders of sects ; as *Hegesippus*, in *Eusebius* Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 22.—It is said, his followers accounted him the Messiah ; (*Photius*, Biblioth. cxxx.)—and that *he*, at first, claimed to be so ; but afterwards retracted, in presence of his pupil *Simon Magus* ; (*Clemens*, Recogn. L. ii. 8, &c.) *Eulogius*, bp. of Alexandria, in the seventh century, wrote against the Dositheans, (according to *Photius*, Biblioth. cxxx.) and besides his pretended messiahship, he attributes to Dositheus various errors ; all of which coincided with either Sadducean or Samaritan opinions. See *J. E. C. Schmidt*, Handb. d. christl. Kirchengeschichte, Vol. i. § 50. p. 214 &c. Tr.]

(8) See *Origen*, adv. Celsum, Lib. v. p. 272. ed. Spencer.

(9) See the Dissertation by *G. C. Voelger*, revised and published by *Mosheim*, Diss. ad Histor. Eccles. Pertinentes, Vol. ii. p. 55 &c. de uno Simone Mago. [The idea of *two Simons*, the one a Samaritan, mentioned *Acta viii.* the other a Jewish philosopher, in the reign of *Domitian*, and the father of all the Gnostic sects ; was first thrown out as a conjecture, by *Camp. Vitranga*, Observ. sacrar. L. v. c. 12. § 9. p. 159. and afterwards defended by *C. A. Heumann*, Acta erudit. Lips. for April, AD. 1717. p. 179, and *J. de Beausobre*, Diss. sur les Adamites, Pt. II. subjoined to *L'Enfant's* Histoire de la guerre des Hussites, § 1. p. 350 &c.—But this hypothesis is now generally given up Tr.]

either a Samaritan, or a Jew; and after studying philosophy at Alexandria,(10) professed to be a magician, as was common in that age: and by his fictitious miracles, persuaded the Samaritans among others, that he had received from God, the power of controlling those evil spirits which afflict mankind. Acts viii. 9, 10. On seeing the miracles which *Philip* performed by divine power; Simon joined himself to Philip, professed to be a christian, and hoped to learn from the christians the art of working miracles. When cut off from this hope, by the pointed reproof of *Peter*, Acts viii. 9, 10. he not only returned to his old course of sorcery, but wherever he went, he labored to obstruct the progress of christianity. The accounts of his tragical death, and of a statue decreed him at Rome, are rejected with great unanimity by the learned, at the present day. They are at least uncertain and improbable.(11)

§ 13. Simon undoubtedly belonged to that class of philosophers who admitted, as co-existent with the supreme and all-perfect God, not only eternal *matter*, but an *evil deity* who presided over it. And if I mistake not, he was one of those in this class, who believed matter to have been eternally animated, and at a certain period to have brought forth by its inherent energies, that depraved being who now rules over it, surrounded by numerous attendants. From this opinion of Simon, the other gross errors ascribed to him by the ancients concerning *fate, the indifference of human actions, the impurity of the human body, the power of magic, &c.* would very naturally follow.(12) The most shocking of all

(10) *Clementina*, Homil. ii. in Patr. Apostol. tom. ii. p. 533.

(11) See *Is. de Beausobre*, Histoire de Manichée, p. 203, 305. *Anth. van Dale*, Diss. de Statua Simonis; annexed to his book de Oraculis, p. 579. *Sal. Deyling*, Observat. sacrar. L. I. Observ. xxxvi. p. 140. *Seb. Tillemont*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 340. and numerous others.—[What *Arnobius*, adv. Gentes, L. ii. p. 64. ed. Herald, and after him, many others relate, with some variety, concerning Simon's death; viz. that while practicing magic at Rome, in order to ingratiate himself with *Nero*, he attempted to fly, being assisted by evil spirits; but that by the prayers of St. *Peter*, the evil spirits were compelled to let him fall, which either killed him outright, or broke his bones and so mortified him, that he killed himself; is too improbable, and has too much the aspect of fiction, to gain credit in this enlightened age.—And the mistake of *Justin Martyr*, Apol. i. c. 34. who says he saw a public statue, inscribed to *Simon*, on an island in the Tiber at Rome; has been satisfactorily accounted for, since the discovery in the year 1574, of a stone in the Tiber at Rome, bearing this inscription: *Semoni Sanco, Deo Fidio*. For this inscription, which *Justin*, being an Asiatic, might easily misunderstand, was undoubtedly intended for an ancient pagan god. Tr.]

(12) The dissertation of *Jo. Hen. Horbicus*, de Simone Mago, though a juvenile production and needing correction in style, I prefer to all others on this subject. It will be found republished by *Jo. Voigtius*, in the Biblioth. Haeresiologica, tom. I. P. III. p. 511. Horbicus treads closely in the steps of his preceptor, *Ja. Thomasius*; who very clearly saw the source of those numerous errors by which the Gnostics, and especially Simon, were infected. The other writers who have treated of Simon, are enumerated by *Voigtius*, ubi supra, p. 567 [See *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketz. vol. I. p. 152 &c. The English reader

his abominations was, his pretence that the greatest and most powerful of the divine *Aeons* of the male sex, resided in himself; and likewise, that another *Aeon* of the female sex, the mother of all human souls, resided in his mistress *Helena*; and his proclaiming that the supreme God had dispatched *him* down to this world, to break up the empire of the world's creator, and to deliver *Helena* out of that tyrant's hands.(13)

§ 14. From Simon Magus it is said, *Menander*, who was also a Samaritan, learned *his* doctrine: which is no more true than what the ancients relate, that all the heretical sects derived their origin from this Simon. *Menander* is to be stricken from the list of proper *heretics*, and to be classed among the lunatics and madmen, who foolishly arrogated to themselves the character of Saviors of mankind. For it appears from the testimony of *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Tertullian*,(14) that he wished to be thought one of the *Aeons*, sent from the upper world or the *Pleroma*, to succor the souls that were here suffering miserably in material bodies; and to afford them aid against the machinations and the violence of the demons who governed our world. As he erected his religious system on the same fundamental principles as Simon did his, the ancients supposed that he must have been a disciple of Simon.

§ 15. If those now mentioned are excluded from the number of the *heretics* of the first century, the first place among the christian sects, and also among those denominated Gnostics, seems to belong to the *Nicolaitans*; of whom *Jesus Christ* himself expressed his detestation, Apoc. ii. 6, 14, 15. It is true, the Savior does not tax them with errors in matters of *faith*, but only with licentious *conduct*, and a disregard of the injunction of the apostles to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from fornication. Acts xv. 29. But the writers of the second and the following centuries, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alex.*(15) and others, declare that they taught the same doctrines with the Gnostics, concerning *two principles* of all things, and concerning the *Aeons*, and the origin of the present world. Whether this testimony is to be admitted, or whether we are to suppose that the ancients confounded *two* different sects which bore the same

will find a full, but not a very accurate account of Simon in *Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible.* Tr.]

(13) Some very learned men, I am aware, have supposed that the ancient accounts of Simon's *Helena* should be interpreted allegorically; and that Simon intended, by the name of *Helena*, to indicate *matter*, or *the soul*, or something, I know not what. But for such an allegorical interpretation, it would be easy to shew there is little foundation.

(14) *Irenæus*, Lib. i. c. 23. *Justin Martyr*, Apol. ii. p. 69. *Tertullian*, de Anima. cap. 50. and de Resurrect. c. 5. Tr.]

(15.) [*Irenæus*, Lib. iii. c. 2. and L. ii. c. 27. *Tertull.* de Praescript. c. 46. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. L. iii. c. 4. Tr.]

name ; the one, the *Apocalyptical* Nicolaitans ; and the other, a Gnostic sect of the second century, founded by a man named *Nicolaus* ; is a question which admits of doubt.(16)

§ 16. With greater propriety, we may reckon among the Gnostics, *Cerinthus*, a Jew by birth,(17) but educated and taught philosophy at Alexandria.(18) Though some of the learned have chosen to assign him rather to the *second* century than to the first,(19) yet it appears that it was while *St. John* was still living, that he endeavored to form a new sect and to inculcate a singular system of religion, compounded of the doctrines and principles of *Jesus Christ*, and those of the Gnostics and Jews. From the

(16) [See *Demonstratio Sectae Nicolaitarum*, adv. doctiss. ejus oppugnatores, cum Supplemento ; in *Mosheim's* Dissertt. at Hist. Eccles. pertinent. vol. I. p. 389—495. Also *Mosheim's* Institut. Hist. Christ. major. p. 46. and *Comment de Reb. Christ. ante Constant. M.* p. 195. and especially *C. W. F. Walch*, Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. I. p. 167. All the ancients, except *John Cassianus*, (*Collatio* xviii. c. 16.) supposed that *Nicolaus* of Antioch, the Deacon, (*Acts* vi. 5.) was either the founder or accidental cause of this sect. *Irenæus* makes him to have been the *founder* of it. But *Clemens Alex.* states, that an incautious speech or act of his, gave *occasion* only to this sect. For he being one day accused of too much attention to his wife ; when he came to defend himself, he publicly divorced her ; using the expression, ὅτι παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ θεῷ, *it is proper to abuse the flesh* ; i. e. to subdue its corrupt propensities. This speech was afterwards perversely applied by a Gnostic association to justify their abominations. To this account, agree *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. L. iii. c. 29. *Theodoret*, Hæret. Fab. L. iii. c. 1. tom. IV. Opp. p. 226. and *Augustine*, de Hæres. cap. 5. Now the question arises, whether there actually was in the time of *St. John*, an heretical party holding different fundamental principles from the orthodox, and distinguished by the name of *Nicolaitans*. Some say there was ; others say, there was not. Dr. *Mosheim* takes the affirmative, on account of the historical credibility of the Fathers, and the literal import of the words used in the *Apocalypse*. The next question is, Who was the founder of this sect ? Here, some follow *Irenæus* ; others follow *Clemens Alex.* and some, among whom is Dr. *Mosheim*, think it probable, there were *two* persons of the name of *Nicolaus*. If this supposition be admitted, it will be easy to account for the fact, that the Nicolaitans of the Fathers, are accused of Gnosticism, while there is no mention of it in the *Apocalypse*.—*Baumgarten's* Auszug der Kirchengeschichte. Schl.]

(17) [For *Epiphanius* states, Hæres. xxviii. § 3. that he was *circumcised* ; and *Johannes Damascenus*, de Hæres. cap. 8. that his followers were *Jews*. His doctrines also, shew a higher respect for the Jewish forms of worship, than is common for the Gnostic heretics. *Walch's* Entw. der Historie der Ketz. Vol. I. p. 250. Schl.]

(18) *Theodoret*, Fabul. Hæret. Lib. ii. cap. 3. Opp. tom. III. p. 219.

(19) See *Sam. Basnage*, Annal. polit. eccles. tom. II. p. 6. *Peter Faydit*, Eclaircissements sur l'histoire eccles. de deux premiers siècles, cap. v. p. 64. and others.—With these, *Jo. Fr. Buddens* contends, de Ecclesia Apostol. cap. v. p. 412. [and *Tillemont*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tome II. p. 486. and *Mosheim*, Institut. hist. eccles. major. Sec. I. p. 439 &c. They who place *Cerinthus* in the *second* century, rely chiefly on two arguments. The *first* is, that the ancient writers who treat of the heretics, set down *Cerinthus*, after *Marcion*, [rather after *Carpocrates*. Tr.] The other, rests on a spurious letter of *Pius*, bishop of Rome [in the middle of the *second* century. Tr.] to *Justus*, bishop of Vienne ; in which *Pius* laments that *Cerinthus* was at that time making many proselytes. The epistle may be found in *Constant. Epistol. Pontific. Append. tom. I. p. 19.* [and in *Binius*, Concil. Gen. tom. I. p. 124. Tr.] But the *first* argument proves nothing, because the historians of the heresies pay no regard to chronological order ; and the *second* falls, because the epistle is not

Gnostics, he borrowed the notions of a *Pleroma*, *Aeons*, a *Demiurge*, &c. but these he so modified, that they appeared not wholly inconsistent with the opinions of the Jews. Therefore, to the creator of this world, whom also he acknowledged to be the sovereign and the lawgiver of the Jewish nation, he ascribed a *nature* possessed of the highest virtues and derived from the true God; but which, he affirmed had gradually receded from its primitive excellence and deteriorated. Hence *God* had determined to subvert his power by means of one of the blessed *Aeons*, whose name was *Christ*. This *Christ* had entered into a certain Jew named *Jesus*, (a very righteous and holy man, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, by ordinary generation,) by descending upon him in the form of a dove, at the time when he was baptized by *John* in the river *Jordan*. After his union with *Christ*, this *Jesus* vigorously assailed the god of the Jews, the world's creator; and by *his* instigation, *Jesus* was seized by the rulers of the Jewish nation and nailed to the cross. But when *Jesus* was apprehended, *Christ* flew away to heaven; so that only the man *Jesus* was put to death. *Cerinthus* required his followers to worship the supreme God, the father of *Christ*, together with *Christ* himself; but to abandon the Jewish Lawgiver, whom he accounted the creator of this world; and while they retained some parts of the Mosaic law to regulate their lives, chiefly by the precepts of *Christ*. He promised them a resurrection of their bodies; which would be succeeded by exquisite delights, in the millenary reign of *Christ*; and then would follow a happy and never ending life in the celestial world. For *Cerinthus* supposed that *Christ* would hereafter return, and would unite himself again with the man *Jesus*, in whom he had before dwelt; and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine. (20)

§ 17. Those who maintained the necessity of the Mosaic law and ceremonies in order to eternal salvation, had not proceeded so far in this century, as to have no communion with such as thought differently. They were of course accounted brethren, though weaker ones. But after the second destruction of Jerusa-

genuine. *Schl.*—But, see on this subject, *Fr. Ad. Lampe*, Commentar. in Johan. Proleg. Lib. ii. c. 3. § 13 &c. p. 181 &c. *Tr.*]

(20) [The doctrines of *Cerinthus* are stated in full, by *C. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf der Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. 1. p. 260 &c. and by *Mosheim*, Institut. Hist. Christ. major. p. 445. and Comment. de Reb. Christianor. ante Constant. M. p. 196.—It may be remarked, that *Irenæus*, adv. Haeres. L. iii. c. 3. says he had heard from various persons, that *Polycarp* told them, that the apostle *John* once met *Cerinthus* in a public bath at Ephesus, and instantly fled out, saying he was afraid the bath would fall on that enemy of the truth and kill him. This story may be true; notwithstanding *Irenæus* had it from third hand testimony. But the addition to it, that *Cerinthus* was actually killed by the fall of the building, as soon as *John* was gone out, was first annexed in modern times by the Dominican *Bernhard* of Luxemburg, in his Catalogus Haereticorum; and it deserves no credit. See *Walch*, ubi supra. p. 255. *Schl.*]

lem in the reign of *Adrian*, when they withdrew from the other christians and set up separate congregations; they were regarded as *sectarians*, who had deviated from the true doctrines of *Christ*. Hence arose the names, *Nazareans*(21) and *Ebionites*;(22) by which those christians, whose errors originated from an attachment to the Mosaic law, were discriminated from the other christians, who held that the Mosaic ceremonial law was abrogated by *Christ*. These *Nazareans* or *Ebionites*, though commonly set down among the sects of the apostolic age, in reality belong to the *second* century, in which they first became a distinct sect.

(21) [This name the Jews first gave by way of reproach, to the disciples of *Christ*; because *he* was a citizen of *Nazareth*. Acts xxiv. 5. Afterwards the name was applied, especially to a christian sect, which endeavored to unite the Mosaic law with the religion of *Christ*. Of these Nazareans, *Mosheim* treats largely, Institut. Hist. Christ. major. p. 465. and Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 328. as also *C. W. F. Walch*, Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. I. p. 101. &c. Schl.]

(22) [The origin of this name is still a subject of controversy. Some derive it from some founder of this sect, who was called *Ebion*. Others think the name *Ebionites*, to be equivalent to the Hebrew word עֲבִיּוֹנִים *poor people*. But they are not agreed, *why* this name was given to the sect. Others again, regard the whole subject as a historical problem, that can never be solved with absolute certainty. It is treated of largely, by *C. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf der Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. I. p. 110. and by *Mosheim*, Institut. Historiae Christ. major. p. 477. and in his Diss. qua ostenditur, certo hodie et explorare constitui non posse, utrum *Ebion* quidam novae Sectae auctor extiterit olim inter Christianos, nec ne? in his Dissertt. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent. vol. I. p. 547 &c. See also *Chr. Alb. Doederlein*, Commentar. de Ebionaeis e numero hostium Christi eximendis, Büzow. 1770. 8vo. Schl.]

CENTURY SECOND.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Character of the Roman emperors.—§ 2. Propagation of christianity in the Roman empire.—§ 3. Countries enlightened by christianity.—§ 4. Conversion of the Germans.—§ 5. The Gauls converted.—§ 6. Translation of the N. T.—§ 7. Apologies and other writings of christians.—§ 8. Miracles and extraordinary gifts.—§ 9. Miracle of the thundering legion.—§ 10. It is uncertain.—§ 11. Sedition and slaughter of the Jews—§ 12. Philosophers become christians.

§ 1. Most of the Roman emperors of this century were of a mild and equitable character. *Trajan*, [AD. 98—117.] though too eager for glory, and not always sufficiently considerate and provident, was humane and equitable. *Adrian*, [AD. 117—138.] was more severe, yet not absolutely bad and tyrannical; his character was a compound of virtues and vices. The *Antonines* [*Pius* AD. 133—161. *Marcus Aurelius the Philos.* AD. 161—180. with *Verus* AD. 161—169. and *Commodus* AD. 169—192.] were models of excellence and benignity. Even *Severus* [AD. 193—211.] who afterwards assumed another character, was at first oppressive to no one, and to the christians mild and equitable.

§ 2. Through this lenity of the emperors, christians living in the Roman empire suffered far less, than they would have done if they had been under severer lords. The laws enacted against them were indeed sufficiently hard; and the magistrates, excited by the priests and the populace, often made considerable havoc among them, and went frequently much beyond what the laws required. Yet for these evils some relief was commonly attainable. *Trajan* would not have the christians to be sought after;

and he forbid any complaints being received against them, *without the names of the accusers annexed*.(1) And *Antoninus Pius* even decreed, that their accusers should be punished.(2) Some in one way, and others in another, protected them against the evil designs of the populace and the priests. Hence the christian community increased, and became vastly numerous in this century. Of this fact we have the clearest testimony of the ancients, which some have in vain attempted to call in question.(3)

§ 3. On what particular countries, both within the Roman empire and beyond it, the light of heavenly truth first shone in this century, the defects in the ancient records will not allow us to state with precision. There are unexceptionable witnesses, who declare, that in nearly all the East, and among the Germans, the Spaniards, the Celts, the Britons, and other nations, *Christ* was now worshipped as God.(4) But if any enquire, which of these nations received christianity in *this* century, and which in the preceding? it is not in my power to answer.—*Pantaenus*, master of the school at Alexandria, is said to have instructed the Indians in christianity.(5) But these Indians appear to have been certain

(1) See *Pliny's* Epistles, Lib. x. Ep. 98.

(2) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. cap. 13. [where the law of *Antoninus* is given at length, from the Apology of *Melito*. Some indeed have supposed that it was *Marcus Antoninus*, and not *Antoninus Pius*, who issued this decree. (So *Valesius* in loc.) But this is contrary to the express testimony of *Eusebius*, and to the contents of the edict itself. For we know from history, that the earthquakes mentioned in the edict, happened under *Pius*. See *Capitolinus*, Life of *Antoninus Pius*, cap. 9. Besides, if *Marcus* himself had published this edict, *Melito* could have had no occasion, by this Apology, to implore the grace of the emperor in favor of the christians. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. ante Constant. M. p. 240. Schl.]

(3) See *Walt. Moyle*, de Legione fulminatrice; a Latin translation of which, with notes, I have annexed to my Syntagma Diss. ad sanctiores disciplinas pertinent. p. 652. 661. See also an additional passage, in *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 341.

(4) *Irenæus*, adv. Hæres. L. i. c. 10. *Tertullian*, adv. Judæos, cap. 7. [The testimony of the former, is this: "Neither do those churches, which are established among the *Germans*, believe or teach otherwise; nor do those among the *Hiberii*, or among the *Celts*; nor those, in the *East*; nor those, in *Egypt*; nor those, in *Libya*; nor those established in the *central parts of the world*."—The language of *Tertullian* is rhetorical, and the statement, undoubtedly, somewhat too strong. He says: "In whom, but the *Christ* now come, have all nations believed? For, in whom do all other nations (but yours, the Jews,) confide; *Parthians*, *Medes*, *Elamites*, and the dwellers in *Mesopotamia*, *Armenia*, *Phrygia*, *Cappadocia*, and inhabitants of *Pontus* and *Asia* and *Pamphylia*; the dwellers in *Egypt*, and inhabitants of the region beyond *Cyrene*? *Romans* and strangers; and in *Jerusalem* both *Jews* and proselytes; so that the various tribes of the *Gottuli* and the numerous hordes of the *Mauri*; all the Spanish clans, and the different nations of *Gauls*, and the regions of the *Britons* inaccessible to the *Romans* but subject to *Christ*, and of the *Sarmatians* and *Dacians* and *Germans* and *Scythians*, and many unexplored nations and countries and islands unknown to us, and which we cannot enumerate:—in all which places, the name of the *Christ* who has already come, now reigns." Tr.]

(5) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. v. c. 10. *Jerome*, de Scriptoribus Illustr. c. 36. [According to *Eusebius*, the zeal of *Pantaenus* prompted him to undertake a vol.

Jews, living in Arabia Felix. For Pantaenus found among them according to the testimony of *Jerome*, the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, which they had received from their first teacher *Bartholomew*.

§ 4. From *Gaul*, it would seem, the christian religion must have spread into *Germany* on the left of the Rhine, which was subject to the Romans, and also into *Britain* over against Gaul. (6) Yet certain churches in Germany have been accustomed to deduce their origin from the companions and disciples of *St. Peter* and other apostles; (7) and the Brittons, following the account given by *Beda*, would fain believe, that their king *Lucius* sought and obtained christian teachers from *Eleutherus* the Roman pontiff, in this second century, and during the reign of *Marcus An-*

untary mission among the Indians. But according to *Jerome*, (de Scriptor. illustr. c. 36. and Epist. 83. Opp. tom. iv. P. II. p. 656. ed. Bened.) he was sent out by *Demetrius* bp. of Alexandria, in consequence of a request made by the Indians for a christian teacher. Perhaps *Pantaenus* first spontaneously travelled among the nearer Arabians; and, upon the request of the people here called Indians for a teacher, *Demetrius* directed him to visit that people.—As it is well known that the Greek and Latin writers give the name of *Indians* to the Persians, Parthians, Medes, Arabians, Ethiopians, Libyans, and many other nations, to them little known; the learned have enquired, who were the Indians visited by *Pantaenus*? Many think they were those we call the East Indians, inhabiting the country about the river Indus. *Jerome* so thought; for he represents him as sent to instruct the *Brachmans*. *Hen. Valesius* and *Lui. Holstenius* and others suppose, they were the Abyssinians or Ethiopians; who are often called Indians, and were near, and always had intercourse with the Egyptians. See *S. Rasmage*, Annal. polit. eccles. tom. ii. p. 207. *Valesius*, Adnotat. ad *Socratis* Hist. Eccles. p. 13. Others incline to believe them *Jews*, resident in *Yemen* or Arabia Felix, a country often called India. That they were not strangers to christianity, is evident from their having *Matthew's Gospel* among them, and from their desiring some one to expound it to them. Their applying to the bp. of Alexandria, shows that *Egypt* was to them the most accessible christian country; and their having the Gospel written in *Hebrew*, as *Jerome* testifies, is good proof that they were *Jews*; because no other people understood that language. Besides, *Bartholomew* had formerly been among them; the field of whose labors has been supposed to be Arabia Felix. See *Tillemont's* life of *Bartholomew*, in his *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 1160, 1161.—See *Mosheim* de Reb. Christ. ante C. M. p. 206, 207. Tr.]

(6) On the origin of those *German* churches, mentioned by *Tertullian* and *Irenaeus* as existing in this century, *Jo. Hen. Ursinus*, *Bebelius* and others have written; and still better, *Gabriel Liron*, Singularitez historiques et litteraires, tom. iv. Paris, 1740. 8vo.—The common and popular accounts of the first preachers of the Gospel in Germany, are learnedly impugned by *Aug. Calmet*, Histoire de Lorraine, tom. i. Diss. sur les Evêques de Treves, p. 3, 4. *Bolland*, Acta sanctorum, January, tom. ii. p. 922. *Jo. Nic. de Hontheim*, Diss. de ora episcopat. Trevirensis; in Historiæ Trevirensis tom. 1.

(7) [It is said, *St. Peter* sent *Eucherius*, *Valerius* and *Maternus* into Belgic Gaul; and that they planted the churches of Cologne, Treves, Tongres, Liege and some others; and presided over them till their death. See *Christo. Brower*, Annales Trevirenses, L. ii. p. 143 &c. and Acta Sanctor. Antwerpiensia, 29th of January, p. 918.—But *Calmet*, *Bolland*, and *Hontheim*, (ubi supra) have proved satisfactorily, that these pretended founders of the German churches, did not live earlier than the *third* or *fourth* century; and were first represented as being legates of the apostles, in the middle ages.—See *Mosheim* de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 212. Tr.]

toninus.(8) But these ancient accounts are exposed to much doubt, and are rejected by the best informed persons.

§ 5. Transalpine Gaul, which is now called *France*, perhaps received some knowledge of the Gospel before this century, either from the apostles or from their friends and disciples. But unequivocal proofs of the existence of churches in this part of Europe first occur in the present century. For in it *Pothinus*, a man of distinguished piety and devotedness to *Christ*, in company with *Irenæus* and other holy men, proceeded from Asia to Gaul, and

(8) See *Ja. Usher*, *Antiquitates Ecclesiar. Britannicar.* cap. i. p. 7. *Francis Godwin*, *de Conversione Britann.* cap. i. p. 7. *Rapin de Thoyras*, *History of England*, vol. I. [*Wil. Burton*, *Adnotat. ad Clementis Rom. Epist. ad Corinth.* in *Patribus Apostol.* tom. ii. p. 470. *Edw. Stillingfleet*, *de Antiquitate Ecclesiar. Britann.* cap. i. *Fred. Spanheim*, *Historia Eccles. major*, *Sæcul.* ii. p. 603, 604.—The first publication of the Gospel in Britain, has been attributed to *James the son of Zebedee*, whom Herod put to death, (*Acts* xii. 1.) to *Simon Zelotes*, another apostle, to *Aristobulus*, (mentioned *Rom.* xvi. 10.) to *St. Peter*, &c. by some few legendary writers, who are cited by *Usher*, *Ecclesiar. Britann. Primordia*, cap. i.—But rejecting these accounts, *William of Malmesbury*, and after him many other monks, maintained that *Joseph of Arimathea* with twelve others, were sent from Gaul, by *St. Philip*, into Britain AD. 63; that they were successful in planting christianity; spent their lives in England; had twelve hides of land assigned them by the king at Glastonbury, where they first built a church of hurdles, and afterwards established a monastery. By maintaining the truth of this story, the English clergy obtained the precedence of some others, in several councils of the 15th century, and particularly that of *Basil* AD. 1434. (*Usher's Primordia*, ch. ii. p. 12—30.) Since the reformation this story has been given up, by most of the English clergy. But, as *Eusebius* (*Demonstrat. Evang.* L. iii. c. 5.) and *Theodoret* (*Graecar. Curatio Affectionum* L. ix.) name the Britons among others, to whom the *Apostles* themselves preached the Gospel, some have maintained, that *St. Paul* must have visited that country; and they urge that *Clemens Rom.* says, that this apostle travelled ἐπὶ τὸ ἑσπέρια τῆς οὐσίας to the utmost bounds of the west. They also urge, that among the many thousand Romans who passed over into Britain in the reign of *Claudius* and his successors, there were doubtless some christians, who would spread the knowledge of *Christ* there. But the principal reliance has been on the reported application of king *Lucius* to pope *Eleutherus* for christian teachers, about AD. 150, or rather 176. (*Usher*, *Primordia*, ch. iv. p. 44 &c.)—On all these traditions *Dr. Mosheim* passes the following judgment. Whether any apostle, or any companion of an apostle, ever visited Britain, cannot be determined; yet the balance of probability rather inclines towards the affirmative. The story of *Joseph of Arimathea*, might arise from the arrival of some christian teacher from Gaul, in the second century, whose name was *Joseph*. As the Gauls, from *Dionysius*, bp. of Paris in the second century, made *Dionysius* the Areopagite to be their apostle; and the Germans made *Maternus*, *Eucherius* and *Valerius*, who lived in the third and fourth centuries, to be preachers of the first century, and attendants on *St. Peter*; so the British monks, I have no doubt, made a certain *Joseph*, from Gaul, in the second century, to be *Joseph of Arimathea*.—As to *Lucius*, I agree with the best British writers, in supposing him to be the restorer and second father of the English churches, and not their original founder. That he was a king, is not probable; because Britain was then a Roman province. He might be a nobleman, and governor of a district. His name is Roman. His application, I can never believe was made to the bp. of Rome. It is much more probable, he sent to Gaul for christian teachers. The independence of the ancient British churches on the see of Rome, and their observing the same rights with the Gallic churches, which were planted by Asiatics, and particularly in regard to the time of Easter; show that they received the Gospel from Gaul, and not from Rome.—See *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christ.* &c p. 213 &c. Tr.]

- there instructed the people with such success, that he gathered churches of christians at *Lyons* and *Vienne*, of which *Pothinus* himself was the first bishop.(9)

(9) *Peter de Marca*, *Epistola de Evangelii in Gallia initiis*; published among his *Dissertations*, and also by *Valesius*, subjoined to *Eusebii Historia Eccles. Jo. Launai*, *Opuscula*, in his *Opp.* tom. ii.—*Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i. p. 223. *Gabr. Liron*, *Singularitez historiques et litteraires*; the whole fourth volume, Paris, 1740. 8vo. and others.—[The most eminent French writers have disputed about the origin of their churches. Three different opinions have been advanced. The first is that of *Jo. Launoi*, (ubi supra,) whom many writers of eminence at this day follow. It is, that if we except the Asiatic colonists of Lyons and Vienne, among whom there were christian churches formed about AD. 150; the first propagation of christianity among the Transalpine Gauls, was by missionaries from Rome, about AD. 250. This hypothesis is founded chiefly on the testimony of three ancient writers; viz. *Sulpicius Severus*, *Historia Sacra*. Lib. ii. c. 32. where speaking of the persecution at Lyons and Vienne, under *Marcus Antoninus*, (AD. 177.) he says: *Ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa; serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta; these were the first martyrs among the Gauls; for the divine religion was not received till late beyond the Alps.* The next testimony is that of the author of the *Acts of Saturninus*, bishop of Toulouse, who suffered under *Decius*. The author is supposed to have written in the beginning of the fourth century. He says: *Raras tertio saeculo in aliquibus Galliae civitatibus ecclesias paucorum christianorum devotione consurrexisse: scattering churches of a few christians. arose in some cities of Gaul in the third century.* See *T. Ruinart*, *Acta Martyr. sincera*, p. 130. The third testimony is that of *Gregory* of Tours, the father of French history, (in the *Historia Francor.* Lib. i. cap. 27. and, de *Gloria Confessorum*, cap. 30. ed. *Ruinart*, p. 399.) He says: *sub Decio septem viros ad prædicandum Româ in Galliam missos esse: under Decius, (AD. 248—251.) seven missionaries were sent from Rome to preach in Gaul.* Now these seven missionaries are the very persons, who are said to have been sent thither by *St. Paul* and *St. Peter*; viz. *Trophimus* bishop of Arles, *Stremonius* bishop of Clermont, *Martial* bishop of Limoges, *Paul* bishop of Narbonne, *Saturninus* bishop of Toulouse, *Gratian* bishop of Tours, and *Dionysius* bishop of Paris. The second opinion is, that of the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of the Gallic churches, *Peter de Marca* (ubi Supra,) *Natalis Alexander* (*Histor. Eccles. Saecul. I. Diss. 16, 17. vol. iii. p. 356—420. ed. Paris 1741. 4to.*) and others. They consider *St. Paul* and *St. Peter* as the fathers of their church. *Paul*, they suppose, travelled over nearly all France, in his supposed journey to Spain; and also sent *St. Luke* and *Crescens* into that country. For the last, they allege 2 Tim. iv. 10. "*Crescens to Galatia:*" or rather to *Gaul*, according to *Epiphanius* and others, who, for *Γαλασίαν*, would read *Γαλλίαν*, *St. Peter*, they suppose, sent *Trophimus* his disciple into Gaul. *St. Philip* also, they suppose labored in Gaul. And the seven bishops above mentioned, they say, were sent by the apostles from Rome.—Very few at this day, embrace this opinion entire. It rests principally on very suspicious testimony, or conjectures, and on vulgar traditions. The third opinion takes a middle course, between the first and the second; and is that which is maintained by *Gabr. Liron*, *Diss. sur l'établissement de la religion Chretienne dans les Gauls*; in the fourth volume of his *Singularitez historique, &c.* Paris, 1740. 8vo. It admits what *Launoi*, *Sirmond*, and *Tillemont* have fully proved, that *Dionysius* the first bishop of Paris, was not *Dionysius* the Areopagite, mentioned *Acts xvii. 34.* but a man who lived in the third century. It also gives up the story of *St. Philip*, and of most of the pretended apostolic missionaries to Gaul. But it maintains the probability of *Paul's* travelling over Gaul on his way to Spain; and of his sending *Luke* and *Crescens* to that country; and affirms that in the second century, there were many flourishing churches in Gaul, besides those of Lyons and Vienne.

Dr. Mosheim, (*De Rebus Christ. ante C. M. p. 208 &c*) thinks neither of these opinions is fully confirmed in all its parts. The second, he gives up wholly. The third, he conceives, lacks evidence. Particularly, *Paul's* journey to Spain, is itself questionable; and if admitted, there is no proof that he passed through

§ 6. This rapid propagation of christianity, is ascribed by the writers of the second century almost exclusively to the efficient will of God, to the energy of divine truth, and to the miracles wrought by christians. Yet human counsels and pious efforts ought not to be wholly overlooked. Much was undoubtedly effected by the activity of pious men, who recommended and communicated to the people around them the writings of Christ's ambassadors; which were already collected into one volume. All people, indeed were not acquainted with the language in which these divine books were composed; but this obstacle was early removed by the labors of translators. As the language of the Romans was extensively used, many Latin translations, as we are informed by *Augustine*, (10) were made at an early period. Of these, that which is called the *Italic Version*, (11) was preferred to all others. The Latin version was followed by a Syriac, an Egyptian, an Ethiopic, and some others. But the precise dates of these several translations cannot be ascertained. (12)

§ 7. Those who wrote *apologies* for the christians, and thus

Gaul. For *St. Luke's* mission to Gaul, there is no evidence but the declaration of *Epiphanius*, (Hæres. LI. § 11.) who, to say the least, is not the best authority; and besides, might possibly mean *Cisalpine Gaul*, lying between Dalmatia and Italy. The mission of *Crescens* to Gaul, mentioned by *Epiphanius*, in the same connexion, depends entirely on the contested reading of Γαλλίαν for Γαλατίαν, 2 Tim. iv. 10. and which if admitted, might be understood of *Cisalpine Gaul*. If there were many flourishing churches in Gaul before *Pothinus* went there, (which perhaps was the case,) this will not prove them to have been planted by the apostles and their companions, which is the point contended for.—As to the first opinion, namely, that *Pothinus* and his companions first preached the Gospel in Gaul; it is not fully substantiated. *Sulpicius Severus* only affirms that it was late, before the Gospel was preached there; and not, that it never was preached there till the times of *Pothinus*. The testimony of the *Acts of Saturninus* only shews, that the progress of the Gospel in Gaul was so slow, that there were but few churches there in the third century; which might be true, even if the apostles had there erected one or two churches. The testimony of *Gregory Turonensis*, fully disproves the apostolic age of the seven Gallic missionaries; and shews that the christians in Gaul were few in number, before the reign of *Decius*: but it does not shew when the Gospel was first preached in that country. On the whole, Dr. *Mosheim* thinks it probable, the Gospel was preached in Gaul before the second century, and possibly by *Luke*, or *Crescens*, or even by some apostle. But he thinks, christianity for a long time made very little progress in that country, and that probably the churches there had become almost extinct, when *Pothinus* and his companions from Asia, planted themselves at Lyons and Vienne, about AD. 150. Nearly the same opinion was embraced by *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tome IV. p. 983. Tr.]

(10) *Augustine*, de *Doctrina Christiana*, Lib. ii. cap. 11. and cap. 15. [Qui Scripturas ex Hebraea lingua in Graecam verterunt, numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique, primis fidei temporibus, in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari.—In ipsis autem interpretationibus, *Itala* cæteris præferatur: nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.]

(11) See *J. G. Carpzov*, *Critica Sacra V. T.* p. 663. [and the Introductions to the N Test. by *Michaelis*, *Horne*, and others. Tr.]

(12) See *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, Liv. ix. cap. 1. tome I. p. 450.

met the calumnies and slanders by which they were unjustly assailed, removed some obstacles to the progress of *Christ's* religion, and in this way contributed not a little to the enlargement of the church. For very many were prevented from embracing christianity, solely by those detestable calumnies with which ungodly men aspersed it.(13) Another support to the christian cause, was furnished by the writers against the *heretics*. For the doctrines of these sects were so absurd, or so abominable, and the morals of some of them so disgraceful and impious, as to induce many to stand aloof from christianity. But when they learned from the books against the heretics, that the true followers of *Christ* held these perverse men in abhorrence, their feelings towards them were changed.

§ 8. It is easier to conceive, than to express, how much the *miraculous powers* and the *extraordinary divine gifts*, which the christians exercised on various occasions, contributed to extend the limits of the church. The gift of foreign tongues appears to have gradually ceased, as soon as many nations became enlightened with the truth, and numerous churches of christians were every where established; for it became less necessary than it was at first. But the other gifts, with which God favored the rising church of *Christ*, were, as we learn from numerous testimonies of the ancients, still conferred on particular persons here and there.(14)

(13) ["Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the heathens employed in expressing their hatred against the christians, who were called by them *atheists*, because they derided the heathen polytheism; *magicians*, because they wrought miracles; *self-murderers*, because they suffered martyrdom cheerfully for the truth; *haters of the light*, because, to avoid the fury of the persecutions raised against them, they were forced at first, to hold their religious assemblies in the night; with a multitude of other ignominious epithets employed against them by *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, *Celsus*, &c. See Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian church*, Book I. ch. ii. p. 5." *Macl.*]

(14) Collections of these testimonies have been made, by *Tob. Pfanner*, de donis miraculosis; and by *W. Spencer*, Notes on Origen against Celsus, p. 5, 6. but the most copious is by *Mammachius*, *Origines et Antiquitates Christianæ*, tom. i. p. 363 &c. [The principal testimonies of the second and third centuries, are *Justin Martyr*, *Apol.* ii. c. 6. *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 39 and 82. *Irenæus* L. ii. c. 31. and L. v. c. 6. and in *Euseb.* H. E. L. v. c. 7. *Tertull.* *Apolog.* c. 23, 27, 32, 37. ad Scap. c. 2. *Origen* contra Cels. L. i. p. 7. and L. vii. p. 334. ed. Spencer. *Dionys. Alex.* in *Euseb.* H. E. Lib. vi. c. 40. *Minucius Felix*, *Octav.* p. 361. ed. Paris 1605. *Cyprian*, de *Idol. vanit.* p. 14. ad *Demetrian.* p. 191, ed. Brem.—That what are called the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Spirit, were liberally conferred, not only in this, but also in the following century, especially on those engaged in propagating the Gospel; all who are called christians, believe, on the unanimous and concordant testimony of the ancient writers. Nor do we, in my opinion, hereby incur any just charge of departing from sound reason. For, as these witnesses are all grave men, fair and honest, some of them philosophers, men who lived in different countries, and relate not what they *heard*, but what they *saw*, call God to witness the truth of their declarations, (see *Origen* contra *Celsum*, L. i. p. 35. ed. Spencer,) and do not claim for themselves, but attribute to others, these miraculous powers; what reason can there be, for refusing to believe them? Yet a few years since, there appeared among the Brittons, a man of no ordinary genius and learning, *Conyers Middleton*, who published a considera-

§ 9. I wish we were fully authorized to place among the miracles, what many ancient writers have recorded, concerning a cer-

ble volume, accusing the whole christian world of credulity, in this matter, and boldly pronouncing all that was said or written by the numerous ancients, concerning these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, to be false. See *A free Inquiry into the miraculous powers &c.* London, 1749, 4to. The history of this famous book, and of the sharp contests it produced in England, may be learned from the British, French, and German *Literary Journals*, and from the German translation and refutation of the work, which has been recently published. I shall here offer only a few observations on this, in many respects most important subject. The apostolic age, the learned *Middleton* himself acknowledges, to have been fruitful in miracles and extraordinary gifts. But he denies their continuance after the decease of the apostles; and concludes that whatever accounts exist of miracles in the *second* and *third* centuries, are the invention of crafty imposters, or the dreams of weak and deluded men. And he attributes great importance to this opinion; because the pretended miracles of the Romish saints, rest on the same supports and arguments, as these miracles of the early ages; so that the former can never be disproved, if the latter be admitted. This looks honest, and worthy of a sound christian man; for the divine origin of the christian religion does not depend on the truth of the miracles reported to have been wrought in the *second* and *third* centuries, but is sufficiently proved, if it can be made evident that *Christ and his apostles* had power to suspend the laws of nature. But the discerning reader of the book will perceive, that the author has assailed the miracles of *Christ* and the apostles, by his attack on those of subsequent date; and that he intended to weaken our confidence in all events, which exceed the powers of nature. For, the objections he raises against the miracles of the second and third centuries, are of such a nature as to be readily applied to those of the first.—The substance of his eloquent and learned argumentation, is this. All the writers of the three first centuries, whose works are extant, were ignorant of criticism, and not sufficiently guarded and cautious, but sometimes too credulous. Therefore all that they state, concerning the miracles of their own times, and even of miracles which they saw with their own eyes, ought to be regarded as a fable. As if it were a conceded point, that no man, unless he is a good critic, can distinguish a true miracle from a false one; and, that he must always mistake and err, who sometimes yields his assent sooner than he ought. If this great man had only said, that some of the supernatural events which are reported to have happened in the early ages, are very questionable, the position might be admitted: but to aim, by one such general argument, which is liable to innumerable exceptions, and destitute of a necessary and evident conclusiveness, to overthrow the united testimony of so many pious men, and men sufficiently cautious in other things; indicates, if I do not greatly mistake, a mind of high daring, and covertly plotting against religion itself. It is fortunate that this distinguished man, a little before his death, (for he died the last year [AD. 1750.]) appears to have learned, from the arguments of his opposers, the weakness of his opinions. For in his last reply, published after his death, namely, *A Vindication of the free Inquiry &c.* Lond. 1751. 4to. though he is here more contentious and contumelious than was proper, he plainly acknowledges himself vanquished, and surrenders the palm to his antagonists. For he says, he did not mean to affirm, that no miracles were wrought in the ancient christian church, after the death of the apostles; on the contrary, he concedes, he says, that God did confirm the truth of christianity, as occasion required, by repeated manifestations of his infinite power: all that he aimed to show, was, that the power of working miracles *constantly* and *perpetually* was not exercised in the church, after the apostolic age; and therefore, that credit is not to be given to the statements of those ancient defenders of christianity, who arrogate such a perpetual power: that is, if I can understand him,—among the doctors of the second and third centuries, there was not one that could work miracles, *whenever he pleased*. But this is wholly changing the question. The learned author might have spared himself the labor of writing and defending his book, if this was all he intended when he commenced writing. For, so far as I know, it never came into the head of any

tain legion of christian soldiers in the army of *Marcus Antoninus*, in his war against the Marcomanni [AD. 174.] which by its supplications procured a shower of rain, when the Roman troops were ready to perish with thirst. But the reality of this miracle is a subject of controversy among the learned : and those who think that the christian soldiers misjudged, in regarding that sudden and unexpected shower by which the Roman army was saved, as a miraculous, divine interposition, are supported, not only by very respectable authorities, but by arguments of no little weight. (15)

§ 10. It is certain, that the Roman army, when reduced to the greatest straits, was relieved by a sudden shower : and that this shower was regarded, both by the pagans and the christians, as extraordinary and miraculous ; the latter ascribed the unexpected favor to *Christ's* being moved by the prayers of his friends ; while the former attributed it to Jupiter, or Mercury, or to the power of magic. It is equally certain, I think, that many christians were then serving in the Roman army. And who can doubt that these, on such an occasion, implored the compassion of their God and Savior ? Further, as the christians of those times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and ascribed every unusual and peculiar advantage enjoyed by the Romans to the prayers of christians, it is not strange, that the salvation of the Roman emperor and his army, should be placed among the miracles which God wrought in answer to the prayers of christians. But, as all wise men are now agreed, that no event is to be accounted a miracle, if it can be adequately accounted for on natural principles, or in the common and ordinary course of divine providence ; and as

christian, to maintain that there were men among the christians of the second, third, and fourth centuries, to whom God gave power to work miracles, as often as they pleased, and of what kind they pleased, at all times, and in all places. *Bella geri placuit, nulla habitura triumphos.*—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 221 &c.—Very candid remarks on this subject, may also be found in *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. iv. p. 380 &c. and in *Jortin's* Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. i. passim. Tr.]

(15) The arguments on the two sides of the question, may be seen in *Herm. Witsius*, Diss. de Legione fulminatrice, subjoined to his *Aegyptiaca* ; he defends the reality of the miracle : and *Dan. Laroque*, Diss. de Legione fulminat. subjoined to the *Adversaria Sacra*, of his father *Matth. Laroque* ; who opposes the idea of a miracle :—but best of all in the controversy concerning the miracle of the thundering legion, between *Peter King* [rather the *Rev. Richard King*, of Topsham ; Tr.] and *Walter Moyle* ; which I have translated into Latin, and published, with notes, in my *Syntagma Dissertationum ad disciplinas sanctiores pertinentium*. See also *P. E. Jablonski*, *Spicilegium de legione fulminatrice* ; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens.* tom. viii. p. 417. where in particular, the reasons are investigated, which led the christians improperly to class this rain among the miracles.—[See also *Mosheim* de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 249 &c.—The most important among the ancient accounts of this matter are, on the side of the pagans, *Dion Cassius*, *Historia Romana*, Lib. lxxi. c. 8. *Julius Capitolinus*, *Life of Marcus Antonin.* cap. 24. *Aelius Lamprid.* *Life of Heliogabalus.* cap. 9. *Claudian.* *Consulat.* vi. *Honorii* v.—and on the side of the christians, *Tertullian.* *Apologet.* cap. 5. *ad Scapulam* cap. 4. *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles. L.* v. cap. 5. and *Chronicon*, p. 82. 215. *Xiphilinus*, on *Dion Cassius*, Lib. lxxi. cap. 9, 10. Tr.]

this rain may be easily thus accounted for; it is obvious, what judgment ought to be formed respecting it.

§ 11. The *Jews*, first under *Trajan* [AD. 116] and afterwards under *Adrian* [AD. 132] led on by *Bar Chochebas*, who pretended to be the Messiah, made insurrection against the Romans; and again suffered the greatest calamities. A vast number of them were put to death; and a new city, called *Aelia Capitolina*, was erected on the site of Jerusalem, which, not an individual of the miserable race was allowed to enter.(16) This overthrow of the Jews confirmed, in some measure, the external tranquillity of the christian community. For that turbulent nation had previously been every where the accusers of the christians before the Roman judges; and in Palestine and the neighboring regions, they had themselves inflicted great injuries upon them, because they refused to aid them in their opposition to the Romans.(17) But this new calamity rendered it not so easy for the Jews, as formerly, to do either of these things.

§ 12. The philosophers and learned men, who came over to the christians in this century, were no inconsiderable protection and ornament to this holy religion, by their discussions, their writings, and their talents. But if any are disposed to question, whether the christian cause received more benefit, than injury, from these men; I must confess myself unable to decide the point. For, the noble simplicity and the majestic dignity of the christian religion, were lost, or at least impaired, when these philosophers presumed to associate their dogmas with it, and to bring faith and piety under the dominion of human reason.

(16) *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Tryph. p. 49. 278. [*Dion Cassius*, Hist. Rom. L. 69. cap. 12—14. Tr.]

(17) [*Justin Martyr*, Apolog. I. p. 72. Schl.]

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1, 2. The persecution of Trajan.—§ 3. That of Adrian.—§ 4. That of Antoninus Pius.—§ 5. That of Antoninus Philosophus.—§ 6. Its calamities.—§ 7. The reigns of Commodus and Severus.—§ 8. Calumnies against christians.

§ 1. In the beginning of this century there were no laws in force against the christians; for those of *Nero* had been repealed by the senate, and those of *Domitian* by his successor *Nerva*. But it had become a common custom to persecute the christians, and even to put them to death, as often as the pagan priests, or the populace under the instigation of the priests, demanded their destruction. Hence, under the reign of *Trajan*, otherwise a good prince, *popular tumults* were frequently raised in the cities against the christians, which were fatal to many of them.(1) When therefore such tumults were made in Bithynia, under the proprætor *Pliny* the younger, he thought proper to apply to the emperor for instructions how to treat the christians. The emperor wrote back that the christians *were not to be sought after*, but if they were *regularly accused and convicted*, and yet refused to return to the religion of their fathers, they were to be put to death as being bad citizens.(2)

§ 2. This edict of *Trajan* being registered among the public laws of the Roman empire, set bounds indeed to the fury of the enemies of the christians, but still it caused the destruction of many of them, even under the best of the emperors. For whenever any one had courage to assume the odious office of an accuser, and the accused did not deny the charge [of being a christian,] he might be delivered over to the executioner, unless he apostatised from christianity. Thus by *Trajan's* law, perseverance in the christian religion was a capital offence. Under this law, *Simon* the son of *Cleophas* and bishop of Jerusalem, a venerable old man, being accused by the Jews, suffered crucifixion.(3) According to the same law, *Trajan* himself ordered the great *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, to be thrown to wild beasts.(4) For the *kind of death* was left by the law to the pleasure of the judge.

(1) *Eusebius*, *Historia Eccles.* Lib. iii. cap. 32.

(2) *Pliny*, *Epistol.* Lib. x. Epist. 97, 98. which epistles, many learned men have illustrated by their comments; and especially *Vossius*, *Boehmer*, *Baldwin* and *Heumann*. [See *Milner's Hist. of the chh. of Christ*, Century II. ch. i. Tr.]

(3) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. iii. cap. 32.

(4) See the *Acta martyrii Ignatiani*; published by *Ruinart*, and in the *Patres Apostolici*, and elsewhere. [See above, p. 92, note (31.) and *Milner's Hist. of the Chh. Cent. II. ch. i* p. 138. Tr.]

§ 3. Yet this law of *Trajan* was a great restraint to the priests, who wished to oppress the christians ; because few persons were willing to assume the dangerous office of accusers. Under the reign of *Adrian*, therefore, who succeeded *Trajan* AD. 117, they evaded it by an artifice. For they excited the populace, at the seasons of the public shews and games, to demand with united voice of the presidents and magistrates, the destruction of the christians ; and these public clamors could not be disregarded without danger of an insurrection.(5) But *Serenus Granianus* the proconsul of Asia, made representation to the emperor, that it was inhuman and unjust to immolate men convicted of no crime, at the pleasure of a furious mob. *Adrian* therefore addressed an edict to the presidents of the provinces, forbidding the christians to be put to death, unless accused in due form, and convicted of offence against the laws ; i. e. as I apprehend, he reinstated the law of *Trajan*.(6) Perhaps also the *Apologies* for the christians, presented by *Quadratus* and *Aristides*, had an influence on the mind of the emperor.(7)—In this reign, *Bar Chochebas* a pretended king of the Jews, before he was vanquished by *Adrian*, committed great outrages on the christians, because they would not join his standard.(8)

§ 4. In the reign of *Antoninus Pius*, the enemies of the christians assailed them in a new manner ; for, as the christians by the laws of *Adrian* were to be convicted of some crime, and some of the presidents would not admit their religion to be a crime, they were accused of impiety or atheism. This calumny was met by *Justin Martyr*, in an *Apology* presented to the em-

(5) [It was an ancient custom or law of the Romans, of which many examples occur in their history, that the people when assembled at the public games, whether at Rome or in the provinces, might demand what they pleased of the emperor or magistrates ; which demands could not be rejected. This right indeed, properly belonged only to Roman citizens, but it was gradually assumed and exercised by others, especially in the larger cities. Hence, when assembled at the public games, the populace could demand the destruction of all christians, or of any individuals of them whom they pleased ; and the magistrates dared not utterly refuse these demands.—Moreover, the abominable lives and doctrines of certain heretics of this age, brought odium on the whole christian community ; as we are expressly taught by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. cap. 7.—See *Moshcim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 236. Tr.]

(6) See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 9. and *Fr. Baldwin*, ad Edicta Principum in Christianos, p. 73 &c. [This edict is also given by *Justin Martyr*, Apolog. I. § 68, 69. It was addressed, not only to *Minutius Fundanus* the successor of *Serenus*, but to the other governors of provinces ; as we learn from *Euseb.* H. Eccl. L. iv. c. 26. Schl.]

(7) [These Apologies are mentioned by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 3. and *Jerome*, Epist. ad. Magnum, Opp. tom. iv. p. 656. ed. Benedict. and de Viris Illustr. c. 19, 20.—From this indulgence of the emperor towards the christians, arose the suspicion that he himself inclined to their religion: *Lampridius*, Vita *Alexandri Severi*, cap. 43. Schl.]

(8) *Justin Martyr*, Apolog. ii. p. 72. ed Colon. [*Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. cap. 21. Schl.]

peror. And the emperor afterwards decreed, that the christians should be treated according to the law of Adrian.(9) A little after, Asia Minor was visited with earthquakes ; and the people regarding the christians as the cause of their calamities, rushed upon them with every species of violence and outrage. When informed of this, the emperor addressed an edict to the *Common Council of Asia*, denouncing capital punishment against accusers of the christians, if they could not convict them of some *crime*.(10)

§ 5. *Marcus Antoninus* the *philosopher*, whom most writers extol immoderately for his wisdom and virtue, did not indeed repeal this decree of his father, and the other laws of the preceding emperors ; but he listened too much to the enemies of the christians, and especially to the philosophers, who accused them of the most horrid crimes, and particularly of impiety, of feasting on the flesh of murdered children (*Thyestearum epularum*), and of incest (*Oedipodei incestus*.) Hence no emperor, after the reign of *Nero*, caused greater evils and calamities to light on christians than this eminently wise *Marcus Antoninus* ; nor was there any emperor, under whom more *Apologies* for the christians were drawn up, of which those by *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras* and *Tatian*, are still extant.(11)

§ 6. In the first place, this emperor issued unjust edicts against the christians, whom he regarded as vain, obstinate, deficient in understanding, and strangers to virtue : (12) yet the precise import of these edicts is not now known. In the next place, he allowed the judges, when christians were accused of the crimes already specified, by servants and by the vilest of persons, to put their prisoners to *torture* ; and notwithstanding their most constant denial of the charges alleged against them, to inflict on them

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 26. [where *Melito* tells *Marcus Aurelius*, that his father (*Anton. Pius*) wrote to the *Larissians*, the *Thessalonians*, the *Athenians* and to all the *Greeks*, not to molest the christians. *Schl.*]

(10) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 13. [where the edict is given at length. It may also be seen in *Milner*, Hist. of the chh. Cent. II. ch. 2. vol. I. p. 158 &c. ed. Boston, 1822, where several pious reflections are subjoined.—It has been questioned whether this edict was issued by *Marcus Aurelius*, or by his father *Antoninus Pius*. *Valesius* (on Euseb. H. Eccl. L. iv. c. 13.) decides for the former ; and *Mosheim* (de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 240 &c.) is as decisive for the latter. Others have little doubt, that the whole edict is a forgery of some early christian. For this opinion they urge, that its language is not such as the pagan emperors uniformly use, but is plainly that of an eulogist of the christians. See *A. Neander's Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 1. P. i. p. 151 &c. Tr.]

(11) [Dr. *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 244. characterizes *Marcus Antoninus* as a well disposed, but superstitious man ; a great scholar, but an indifferent emperor. His persecutions of the christians arose from his negligence of business, his ignorance of the character of christians and of christianity, and from his easy credulity and acquiescence in the wishes of others.—His character is also given by *Milner*, Hist. of the Church, Cent. II. ch. 4. and very elaborately, by *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. I. P. I. p. 154 &c. Tr.]

(12) See *Melito*, as quoted by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 26.

capital punishments. For, as the laws would not allow the christians to be executed without a crime, the judges who wished to condemn them, had to resort to some method of making them appear to be guilty. Hence under this emperor, not only were several very excellent men most unjustly put to death, (among whom were *Polycarp*, the pious bishop of Smyrna, and the celebrated philosopher *Justin*, surnamed *Martyr*),(13) but also several christian churches and especially those of Lyons and Vienne in France, AD. 177, were by his order nearly destroyed and obliterated, by various species of executions.(14)

§ 7. Under the reign of *Commodus*, his son, [AD. 180—192,] if we except a few instances of suffering for the renunciation of paganism, no great calamity befel the christians.(15) But when *Severus* was placed on the throne near the close of the century, much christian blood was shed in Africa, Egypt, and other provinces. This is certain, from the testimonies of *Tertullian*,(16) *Clemens Alexandrinus*,(17) and others; and those must mistake the fact who say, that the christians enjoyed peace under *Severus*, up to the time when he enacted laws that exposed them to the loss of life and property, which was in the beginning of the next century. For, as the laws of the [former] emperors were not abrogated, and among these, the edicts of *Trajan* and *Marcus Antoninus* were very unjust; it was in the power of the presidents to persecute the christians with impunity whenever they pleased. These calamities of the christians, near the end of this century, were what induced *Tertullian* to compose his *Apologeticum*, and some other works.(18)

§ 8. It will appear less unaccountable, that so holy a people as the christians, should suffer so much persecution, if it be considered, that the patrons of the ancient superstition continually as-

(13) The *Acta Martyrii* of both *Polycarp* and *Justin Martyr* are published by *Ruinart*, in his *Acta martyr. sincera*. [The former also, in the *Patres Apostol.* The life and martyrdom of *Polycarp*, are the subject of the 5th chapter of *Milner's* Hist. of the chh. Century II. vol. i. p. 176 &c. ed. Boston, 1822, as those of *Justin Martyr*, are of ch. iii. of the same, p. 161 &c. Tr.]

(14) See the Letter of the christians at Lyons giving account of this persecution, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. cap. 2. [also in *Fox*, Book of Martyrs, and in *Milner's* Hist. of the chh. Cent. II. ch. 6. vol. i. p. 185 &c. ed. Boston, 1822. Tr.]

(15) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. cap. 24. and 16, 18, 19.

(16) *Tertullian*, ad Scapulam, cap. 4. and Apologet. cap. 5. which shew that *Severus* himself was, at first, favorable to the christians. But the same Apologet. cap. 35, 49, 7, 12, 30, 37. shews that christians suffered before the enactment of the laws. Schl.]

(17) [*Clemens Alex.* Stromat. L. ii. p. 494. Schl.—See also the account of the martyrs of Scillita in Africa, A. D. 200, in *Ruinart's* Acta Martyr. *Baronius* Ann. A. D. 200, and *Milner*, Hist. of the chh. vol. I. p. 236.

(18) I have expressly treated of this subject in my diss. de vera aetate Apologetici Tertulliani et initio persecutionis Severi; which is the first essay in my Syntagma Diss. ad hist. eccles. pertinent.

sailed them with their railings, clumnies, and libels. Their reproaches and calumnies, of which we have before spoken, are recounted by the writers of the Apologies. The christians were attacked, in a book written expressly against them, by *Celsus*, the philosopher; whom *Origen*, in his confutation of him, represents as an Epicurean, but whom we, for substantial reasons, believe to have been a Platonist of the sect of *Ammonius*.(19) This miserable sophist deals in slander; as *Origen's* answer to him shows. And he does not so much attack the christians, as play off his wit; which is not distinguished for elegance and refinement. *Fronto*, the rhetorician, also made some attempts against the christians; but these have perished, with the exception of a bare mention of them by *Minutius Felix*.(20) To these may be added *Crescens*, a Cynic philosopher, who, though he seems to have written nothing against the christians, yet was very eager to do them harm; and in particular did not cease to persecute *Justin Martyr*, till he compassed his death.(21)

(19) [See *Mosheim's* preface to the German translation of *Origen's* work. Tr. "The learned *Dr. Lardner* does not think it possible, that *Celsus* could have been of the sect of *Ammonius*; since the former lived and wrote in the second century, whereas the latter did not flourish before the third. And indeed, we have from *Origen* himself, that he knew of two only of the name of *Celsus*, one who lived in the time of *Nero*, and the other in the reign of *Adrian*, and afterwards. The latter was the philosopher, who wrote against christianity." *Macl.*]

(20) *Minutius Felix*, Octavius, p. 266, ed. Herald.—[*Minucius* mentions this calumniator in two passages, namely, chap. 10, p. 99, and chap. 31, p. 322; in the former of which, he calls him *Cirtensis noster*; implying, that he was of *Cirta*, in Africa: in the latter passage, he speaks of him as an *orator*, indicating what profession he followed. It has been supposed, by the learned, and not without reason, that this *Fronto* was *Cornelius Fronto*, the rhetorician, who instructed *Marcus Antoninus* in eloquence, (and whose works were first published A. D. 1816, by *Aug. Maius*, Frankf. on Mayn, in 2 parts.) So long as the christian community was made up of unlearned persons, the philosophers despised them. But when, in the second century, some eminent philosophers became christians, as *Justin*, *Athenagoras*, *Pantaenus*, and others, who retained the name, garb, and mode of living of philosophers, and who became teachers of youth, and while they gave a philosophical aspect to christianity, exposed the vanity of the pagan philosophy, and the shameless lives of those addicted to it; the pagan philosophers perceiving their reputations and their interests to be at stake, now joined the populace and the priests in persecuting the christians in general; and they especially assailed the christian philosophers, with their calumnies and accusations. Their chief motive was, not the love of truth, but their own reputation, influence, glory, worldly interest and advantage; just the same causes as had before moved the pagan priests. This war of the philosophers commenced in the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, who was himself addicted to philosophy. And it is easy to see, what induced him to listen to his brother philosophers, and at their instigation, to allow the christians to be persecuted. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 256, &c. Tr.]

(21) *Justin Martyr*, Apologia II. p. 21 ed. Oxon. *Tatian*, Orat. contra Graecos, p. 72 ed. Worthii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning in general.—§ 2, 3. Learned men.—§ 4. Rise of the new Platonics.—§ 5. Eclectics at Alexandria —§ 6. Approved by the christians.—§ 7. Ammonius Saccas.—§ 8. His fundamental principles.—§ 9. His principal doctrines.—§ 10. His austere system of moral discipline.—§ 11. His opinions concerning God and Christ.—§ 12. Ill effects of this philosophy on christianity.—§ 13. The state of learning among christians.

§ 1. Literature, although it seemed in some measure to recover its former dignity and lustre, during the reign of *Trajan*,⁽¹⁾ could not long retain its influence under the subsequent emperors, who were indisposed to patronize it. The most learned among these Roman sovereigns, *Marcus Antoninus*, showed favor only to the philosophers, and especially to the Stoics; the other arts and sciences, he, like the Stoics, held in contempt.⁽²⁾ Hence the literary productions of this age, among the Romans, are far inferior to those of the preceding century, in elegance, brilliance, and good taste.

§ 2. Yet there were men of excellent genius, among both Greeks and Romans, who wrote well on almost every branch of learning then cultivated. Among the Greeks, *Plutarch* was particularly eminent. He was a man of various, but ill-digested learning; and besides was tainted with the principles of the academics. Rhetoricians, sophists, and grammarians had schools in all the more considerable towns of the Roman empire; in which they pretended to train up youth for public life, by various exercises and declamations. But those educated in these schools, were vain, loquacious, and formed for display; rather than truly eloquent, wise, and competent to transact business. Hence the sober and considerate looked with contempt, on the education acquired in the schools of these teachers. There were two public academies, one at *Rome*, founded by *Adrian*, in which all the sciences were taught, but especially jurisprudence; the other at *Berytus*, in Phenicia, in which jurists were principally educated.⁽³⁾

(1) *Pliny*, Epistles, lib. iii. Ep. 18, p. 134, 135, ed. Cortii et Longolii.

(2) *M. Antoninus*, Meditations, or, ad se ipsum, Lib. I. §7, p. 3, 4. §17, p. 17. ed. Lips.

(3) *M. Antoninus*, Meditations, or, ad se ipsum, Lib. I. §7, 10, 17. p. 4, 7, 16. ed. Lips.

§ 3. Many philosophers, of all the different sects, flourished at this time : but to enumerate them, belongs rather to other works than to this.(4) The Stoic sect had the honor of embracing two great men, *Marcus Antoninus*, the emperor, and *Epictetus*.(5) But each of these men had more admirers, than disciples and followers : nor were the Stoics, according to history, held in the highest estimation in this age. There were larger numbers in the schools of the Platonists ; among other reasons, because they were less austere, and their doctrines were more in accordance with the common notions respecting the gods. But no sect appears to have numbered more adherents, than the Epicureans ; whose precepts led to an indulgent, secure and voluptuous life.(6)

§ 4. Near the close of this century, a new philosophical sect suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman empire, and not only nearly swallowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to christianity.(7) Egypt was its birth place, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called *Platonics*. Yet they did not follow *Plato* implicitly, but collected from all systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views. And the ground of their preference for the name of *Platonics*, was, that they conceived, *Plato* had treated that most important branch of philosophy which treats of God and supersensible things, more correctly than any of the others.

§ 5. That controversial spirit in philosophy, which obliged every one to swear allegiance to the dogmas of his master, was now disapproved by the more wise. Hence among lovers of truth and men of moderation, a new class of philosophers had grown up in Egypt, who avoided altercation and a sectarian spirit ; and who professed simply to follow truth, gathering up whatever was accordant with it, in all the philosophic schools. They assumed therefore the name of *Eclectics*. But, notwithstanding these philosophers were really the partizans of no sect, yet it appears from a variety of testimonies, that they much preferred *Plato*,

(4) *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Trypho. Opp. p. 218, &c. Many of the philosophers of this age are mentioned by *M. Antoninus*, Meditat. or, ad se ipsum, Lib. I

(5) [Concerning *M. Antoninus*, see *Brucker's Hist. crit. Philos.* tom. II. p. 578, and for *Epictetus*, Ibid. p. 568 *Schl.*—*Stæudlin*, Gesch. der Moral philos. p. 265, &c. treats of *M. Antoninus* ; and ibid. p. 260, &c. of *Epictetus*. Tr.]

(6) *Lucian*, Pseudomantis ; Opp. tom. I. p. 763.

(7) [See *Dr. Mosheim's Commentat. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, in his syntagma Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent. vol. i. p. 85 &c. and *Brucker's Hist. crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 162 &c. *Schl.*—And, on the contrary, *C. A. T. Keil*, Exercitatt. xviii. de Doctoribus veteris eccles. culpâ corruptæ per Platonicas sententias theologiæ, liberandis, Lips. 1793—1807. 4to. Tr.]

and embraced most of his dogmas concerning God, the human soul, and the universe.(8)

§ 6. This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria, as wished to be accounted christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of the christians at Alexandria, *Athenagoras*, *Pantaenus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, are said to have approved of it.(9) These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore, that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defence of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent their regarding *Plato* as wiser than all others, and as having advanced sentiments concerning God, the soul, and supersensible things, more accordant with the principles of christianity than any other.(10)

§ 7. This [eclectic] mode of philosophising received some modification, when *Ammonius Saccas*, at the close of the century, with great applause, opened a school at Alexandria, and laid the foundation of that sect which is called the *New Platonic*. This man was born and educated a christian, and perhaps made pretensions to christianity all his life.(11) Being possessed of great

(8) [See *Brucker's Hist. crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 189 &c. *Schl.*]

(9) The title and dignity of philosopher so much delighted those good men, that, when made presbyters, they would not abandon the philosopher's *cloak* and dress. See *Origen's* letter to Eusebius, *Opp.* tom. i. p. 2. ed. de la Rue. [*Justin Martyr*, *Dial. cum Trypho.* initium. For proof that *Pantaenus* studied philosophy, see *Origen*, in *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. vi. c. 19. *Jerome*, de *Scriptoribus Illustr.* cap. 20. The proficiency of *Athenagoras* in philosophy, appears from his *Apology*, and his *Essay on the Resurrection*. That *Clemens Alex.* was much addicted to philosophy, is very evident; see his *Stromata*, *passim*.—Concerning the Alexandrian christian school, see *Herm. Conringius*, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 29. *J. A. Schmidt*, *Diss.* prefixed to *A. Hyperii Libellum de Catechesi*, *Domin. Aulsius*, delle Scuole sacre, *Libr.* ii. cap. 1, 2, 21. *Geo. Langemack*, *Historia Catechismorum*, Pt. I. p. 86.—See *Mosheim*, de *Reb. Christ.* &c. p. 273 &c. *Tr.*]

(10) [This cultivation of philosophy by christian teachers, greatly displeased those who were attached to the ancient simple faith, as taught by *Christ* and his apostles; for they feared what afterwards actually happened, that the purity and excellence of divine truth would suffer by it. Hence the christians were divided into two parties, the friends of philosophy and human learning, and the opposers of them. The issue of the long contest between them, was, that the advocates of philosophy prevailed.—Traces of this controversy may be seen in *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. v. c. 28. and in *Clemens Alex.* *Stromat.* *Lib.* i. cap. 1—5.—See *Mosheim*, de *Rebus Christ.* ante *Constant. M.* p. 276 &c. *Tr.*]

(11) [The history of the philosopher *Ammonius* is involved in great obscurity. All that could be gathered from antiquity respecting him, is given by *Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.* tom. ii. p. 205. See also *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Græca*, *Lib.* iv. c. 26. Whether *Ammonius* continued a professed christian, or apostatized, has been much debated. *Porphyry*, who studied under *Plotinus*, a disciple of *Ammonius*, (as quoted by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. vi. c. 19.) says, he was

fecundity of genius as well as eloquence, he undertook to bring all systems of philosophy and religion into harmony, or attempted to teach a philosophy, by which all philosophers, and the men of all religions, the christian not excepted, might unite together and have fellowship. And here, especially, lies the difference between this new sect, and the *eclectic* philosophy which had before flourished in Egypt. For the *Eclectics* held that there was a *mixture* of good and bad, true and false, in all the systems; and therefore they *selected* out of all, what appeared to them consonant with reason, and rejected the rest. But *Ammonius* held that all sects professed *one and the same system* of truth, with only some difference in the *mode of stating* it, and some minute difference in their conceptions; so that by means of suitable explanations, they might with little difficulty be brought into one body.(12) He moreover held this new and singular principle, that the prevailing religions, and the christian also, must be understood and explained according to this common philosophy of all the sects; and that the fables of the vulgar pagans and their priests, and so too the interpretations of the disciples of *Christ*, ought to be separated from their respective religions.

§ 8. The grand object of *Ammonius*, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties, philosophers, priests, and christians; and particularly, by allegorical interpretations, to remove very many impediments out of his way. The manner in which he prosecuted his object, appears in the writings of his disciples and adherents; which have come down to us in great abundance. To make the arduous work more easy, he assumed, that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of

born of christian parents, but when he came to mature years, embraced the religion of the laws: i. e. the pagan religion. *Eusebius* taxes *Porphyry* with falsehood in this; and says, that *Ammonius* continued a christian till his death, as appears from his books, one of which was on the accordance of *Moses* with *Jesus Christ*. *Jerome*, de Scriptoribus Illustr. cap. 55. says nearly the same. *Valesius*, *Bayle*, *Basnage* and Dr. *Mosheim* (when he wrote his essay de ecclesia turbata per recentiores Platonicos,) agreed with *Eusebius* and *Jerome*. But Dr. *Mosheim*, when he wrote his Commentarii de Reb. Christ. fell in with the opinion of *Fabricius*, *Brucker*, and others, (and which is now the general opinion,) that *Eusebius* and *Jerome* confounded *Ammonius* the philosopher, with another *Ammonius*, the reputed author of a harmony of the Gospels and other works; because it can hardly be supposed, this enthusiastic admirer of philosophy, would have found time or inclination for composing such books. Besides, it is said, *Ammonius* the philosopher published no books. Still the question remains, what were the religious character and creed of this philosopher in his maturer years? Dr. *Mosheim* thinks it probable, he did not openly renounce christianity, but endeavored to accommodate himself to the feelings of all parties; and therefore he was claimed by both pagans and christians. Hence, if he was a christian, he was a very inconsistent one, and did much injury to its cause.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus &c. p. 281. Tr.]

(12) [The views of this sect are very clearly expressed by *Julian*, who was a great devotee of this philosophy, Orat. vi. contra Cynicos, Opp. p. 184. Schl.]

the East; that it was inculcated among the Egyptians, by *Hermes*, (13) and thence passed to the Greeks; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still, by *Plato*, the best interpreter of the principles of *Hermes* and of the ancient oriental sages, it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied: (14) that the religions received by the various nations of the world, were not inconsistent with this most ancient philosophy; yet it had most unfortunately happened, that what the ancients taught by symbols and fictitious stories, in the manner of the orientals, had been understood literally by the people and the priests; and thus, the ministers of divine providence, those *demons* whom the supreme Lord of all had placed over the various parts of our world, had erroneously been converted into Gods, and had been worshipped with many vain ceremonies: that therefore, the public religions of all nations should be corrected, by this ancient philosophy: and that it was the sole object of *Christ* to set bounds to the reigning superstition, and correct the errors which had crept into religion, but not to abolish altogether the ancient religions.

§ 9. To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of the Egyptians, (among whom he was born and educated,) concerning the universe and the Deity, as constituting *one great whole*, [*Pantheism*;] (15) concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, and the government of this world by demons; and other received doctrines, all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question. For it is most evident, that the ancient philosophy of the Egyptians, which they pretended to have learned from *Hermes*, was the *basis* of the New Platonic or Ammonian; and the book of *Jamblichus*, de *Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*, in particular, makes this evident. In the next place, with these Egyptian notions, he united the philosophy of *Plato*; which he accomplished with little difficulty, by distorting some of the principles of *Plato*, and putting a false construction on his language. (16) Finally, the dogmas of the other sects he

(13) [This appears from the writings of all his followers, *Plotinus*, *Proclus*, *Porphyry*, *Damascius*, and others. And the learned, not without reason, conjecture that all the works of *Hermes* and *Zoroaster*, which we now have, originated in the schools of these New Platonics. *Schl.*]

(14) [*Jamblichus*, de *Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*. L. i. c. 1, 2. *Schl.*]

(15) [On this principle the whole philosophy of the ancient Egyptians was founded; and on it *Ammonius* erected his system. The book which goes under the title of *Hermetis Trismegisti Sermo*, de *Natura Deorum*, ad *Asclepium*, which is extant in Latin among the works of *Apuleius*, the supposed translator, is evidence of this fact. See also *Eusebius*, *Præparatio evangel.* Lib. iii. c. 9. and *Mosheim's* notes on *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, tom. 1. p. 404 &c. And the same fundamental principle is assumed by *Plotinus*, *Proclus*, *Simplicius*, *Jamblichus*, and all the New Platonics. See, for example, *Porphyry*, in his life of *Plotinus*, cap. 2. p. 94. *Schl.*]

(16) [The principle of the Ammonian and Egyptian philosophy, that God and the world constitute *one indivisible whole*, it cost him much labor to reduce

construed, as far as was possible, by means of art, ingenuity, and the aid of allegories, into apparent coincidence with these Egyptian and Platonic principles.

§ 10. To this Egyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, this ingenious man and fanatic, joined a system of moral discipline apparently of high sanctity and austerity. He indeed, permitted the common people to live according to the laws of their country, and the dictates of nature; but he directed the wise, by means of contemplation, to elevate their souls, which were the offspring of God, above all earthly things; and to weaken and emaciate their bodies, which were hostile to the liberty of their souls, by means of hunger, thirst, labor, and other austerities;(17) so that they might in the present life, attain to communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend, after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal Parent, and be forever united with him. And these precepts, *Ammonius*, who was born and educated among christians, was accustomed to beautify and ennoble by forms of expression borrowed from the sacred scriptures; and hence these forms of expression occur abundantly in the writings of his followers.(18) To this austere discipline, he superadded the art of so purging and improving the imagination, that it was capable of seeing the demons, and of performing many wonderful things by their assistance. His followers called this art *Theurgy*.(19) Yet this art was not cultivated by all the philosophers of *Ammonius*' school, but only by the more eminent.(20)

§ 11. That the prevailing religions, and particularly the christian, might not appear irreconcilable with his system, *Ammonius*

to harmony with the system of *Plato*; who, as we learn from his *Timæus*, taught the eternal existence of matter, as a substance distinct from God. See *Proclus* on the *Timæus* of *Plato*. *Schl.*]

(17) [See *Porphyrus*, de Abstinencia, Lib. I. c. 27, &c. p. 22—34. *Schl.*]

(18) See examples in *Hierocles*, on the golden verses of *Pythagoras*; and in *Simplicius* and *Jamblichus*. See also *Mosheim's* Diss. de studio Ethnicorum Christianos imitandi, in vol. I. of his Diss. and Hist. Eccles. pertinent. p. 321. *Schl.*]

(19) [This worthless science is very similar to what has been called *allowable magic*, and which is distinguished from necromancy, or unlawful magic. It was undoubtedly of Egyptian origin. As the Egyptians imagined the whole world to be full of good and evil spirits, they might easily be led to suppose there must be some way to secure the favor of these demons. See *Augustine*, de Civit. Dei L. x. c. 9. Opp. tom. ix. p. 187. *Schl.*—“*Theurgy* is the science of the Gods, and of the various classes of superior spirits, of their appearing to men, and their operations; and the art, by certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the Gods to impart to men secrets which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open the future to them, and become visible to them. This *theurgy*, which goes further, and rises higher than *philosophy*, was first imparted and revealed to men by the Gods themselves, in ancient times, and afterwards preserved among the priests. So it is described in the book which bears the name of *Jamblichus*, de Mysteriis Agyptiorum, Lib. 1. c. 26—29.” *Stæudlin*, Geschichte der Moralphilosophie, p. 462. *Tr.*]

(20) [See concerning the moral system of the new Platonics, in all its material parts, *Stæudlin*, Geschichte der Moralphilosophie, p. 435, &c. *Tr.*]

first turned the whole history of the pagan gods into allegory,(21) and maintained that those, whom the vulgar and the priests honored with the title of *Gods*, were only the *ministers* of God, to whom some homage might and should be paid, yet short of the superior homage which was due to the Supreme God;(22) and then he acknowledged that *Christ* was an extraordinary man, the friend of God, and an admirable *Theurge*.(23) But he denied that *Christ*, aimed wholly to suppress the worship of the demons, those ministers of divine providence; that on the contrary, *he* only sought to wipe away the stains contracted by the ancient religions,(24) but his disciples had corrupted and vitiated the system of their master.(25)

§ 12. This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by *Origen* and other christians, did immense harm to christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Savior not a few things, of which not a word can be found in the holy scriptures. It also produced that gloomy set of men, called *mystics*; whose system, if divested of its Platonic notions respecting the origin and nature of the soul, will be a lifeless and senseless corpse. It laid a foundation, too, for that indolent mode of life, which was afterwards adopted by many, and particularly by numerous tribes of *monks*; and it recommended to christians vari-

(21) [See, for example, *Porphry*, de Antro Nymphar. apud Homerum de styge, &c. *Schl.*]

(22) *Paul Orosius* Historia, Lib. vi. cap. 1. p. 364, 365. *Schl.*

(23) [It cannot be denied that the sect of *Ammonius* embraced some, who were enemies of *Christ* and of the christians. The emperor *Julian*, and some others, are proof of this. But *Ammonius* himself honored *Christ*. And *Augustine* contended against some philosophers of his time, who, as followers of *Ammonius*, honored *Christ*, yet maintained that the christians had corrupted his doctrine; de Consensu Evangelistarum, Opp. tom. III. P. II. Lib. 1. c. 6. § 11. p. 5. and c. 8. § 14. p. 6. and c. 15. p. 8. *Schl.*]

(24) [*Augustine*, de Consensu Evangel. Lib. I. c. 16. p. 8. and c. 24. p. 18. Yet they admitted that *Christ* abolished the worship of certain demons of an inferior order, and enjoined upon men to pray to the celestial Gods, and especially to the Supreme God. This is evident from a passage of *Porphry*, quoted by *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, Lib. xix. c. 23. § 4. Opp. tom. vii. p. 430. *Schl.*]

(25) What we have stated in these sections respecting the doctrines of *Ammonius*, we have collected from the books and discussions of his followers, who are called *New Platonics*. *Ammonius* himself left no writings; and he forbid his followers ever publishing his doctrines, but they did not obey him. See *Porphry*, Vita Plotini, cap. 3. p. 97. ed. *Fabricii*, Lib. iv. Biblioth. Græca. Yet there can be no doubt, that all we have stated was invented by *Ammonius* himself, whom the whole family of the *New Platonics* constantly affirm to have been the author of their philosophy.—[*Dr. Mosheim*, in his Commentarii de Rebus Christi. ante Constantin. M. § 27—32. p. 280—298, has given a more full account of *Ammonius* and his doctrines, and has cited, particularly, his chief authorities; but the substance of his statements is contained in the preceding sections, and his most important authorities are referred to in the notes of *Schlegel*, which are all here preserved. *Tr.*]

ous foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of christian and platonic principles combined. And who is able to enumerate all the evils and injurious effects, which arose from this new philosophy—or, if you please, from [this *Syncretismus*] this attempt to reconcile true and false religions with each other?

§ 13. The number of learned men among the christians, which was small in the preceding century, was larger in this. And yet we scarcely find among them rhetoricians, sophists, and orators. Most of those, who obtained some reputation among them by their learning, were philosophers: and they, as before stated, followed the principles of the *Eclectics*, and gave *Plato* preference before others. But all christians were not agreed, as to the utility of learning and philosophy. Those who were initiated in the mysteries of philosophy, wished that many, and especially such as aspired to the office of pastors and teachers, might apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, so that they might confute the enemies of truth with more effect, and teach and instruct others with more success. But a great majority thought otherwise; they wished to banish all reasoning and philosophy out of the confines of the church; for they feared, that learning might injure piety. At this time, therefore, broke out the war between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *intelligence*, which has been protracted through all succeeding centuries, down to our own times, and which we by all our efforts cannot easily bring to an end. By degrees, those obtained the ascendancy, who thought that philosophy and erudition were profitable, rather than hurtful, to religion and piety; and laws were at length established, that no person entirely illiterate and unlearned, should be admitted to the office of teacher in the church. Yet the vices of the philosophers and learned men, among other causes, prevented the opposite party from ever being destitute of patrons and advocates. Ample proof of this will be found in the history of the following centuries.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The form of church government.—§ 2. Union of churches in a province. Origin of councils.—§ 3. Their too great authority gave rise to metropolitans and patriarchs.—§ 4. Parallel between the Jewish and christian priesthood.—§ 5. The principal writers.

§ 1. The form of church government, which began to exist in the preceding century, was in this more industriously established and confirmed in all its parts. One president, or *bishop*, presided over each church. He was created by the common suffrage of the whole people. With the *presbyters* for his council, whose number was not fixed, it was his business to watch over the interests of the whole church, and to assign to each *bresbyter* his station. Subject to the bishop, and also to the presbyters, were the servants or *deacons*; who were divided into certain classes, because all the duties which the interests of the church required, could not well be attended to by them all.

§ 2. During a great part of this century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, *independent* of each other, or were connected by no consociations or confederations.(1) Each church was a kind of little, independent republic, governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least sanctioned, by the people. But in process of time, it became customary for all the christian churches within the same province, to unite and form a sort of larger society or commonwealth; and in the manner of confederated republics, to hold their conventions at stated times, and there deliberate for the common advantage of the whole confederation. This custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom a [political] confederation of cities, and the consequent conventions of their several delegates, had been long known; but afterwards, the utility of the thing being seen, the custom extended through all countries where there were christian churches.(2) These con-

(1) [Yet by ancient custom, peculiar respect was paid to the churches founded and governed by the apostles themselves; and such churches were appealed to in controversies on points of doctrine, as most likely to know what the apostles had taught. See *Irenaeus* adv. Haeres. Lib. iii. c. 3. and *Tertullian* de Praescript. adv. Haeres. c. 36. Thus, *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 258. Tr.]

(2) *Tertullian* de Jejuniis, cap. 13. p. 711. [where we have this very important statement: *Aguntur praeterea per Graecias, illa certis in locis Concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magnâ veneratione celebratur.* From this passage of *Tertullian*, which was written near the beginning of the *third* century,

ventions of delegates from the several churches assembled for deliberation, were called by the Greeks *Synods*, and by the Latins *Councils*; and the laws agreed upon in them, were called *canons*, that is *rules*.

§ 3. These councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of this century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were, by them, very much abridged; and on the other hand, the influence and authority of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first, the bishops did not deny, that they were merely the representatives of their churches, and that they acted in the name of the people; but by little and little, they made higher pretensions, and maintained that power was given them by *Christ* himself, to *dictate* rules of faith and conduct to the people. In the next place, the perfect equality and parity of all bishops, which existed in the early times, these councils gradually subverted. For it was necessary that one of the confederated bishops of a province, should be entrusted with some authority and power, in those conventions, over the others; and hence originated the prerogatives of *Metropolitans*. And lastly, when the custom of holding these councils had extended over the christian world, and the universal church had acquired the form of a vast republic, composed of many lesser ones, certain head men were to be placed over it in different parts of the world, as central points in

Dr. *Mosheim* (de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 266, &c.) infers, 1, that provincial councils had not then been held in Africa, nor any where except among the *Greeks*; 2, that councils were considered as human institutions, and as acting only by *human authority*. 3. That the provincial councils were held always in the *same places*—*certis in locis*;—4. that they did not interfere with the *private concerns* of individual churches, which were left to their own management; but conferred only on *greater* matters, or such as were of *common interest*—*altiora*—tractantur; 5, that the attending bishops acted as *representatives of their churches*, and not as men clothed with authority from heaven, by virtue of their office—*representatio totius nominis Christiani*. From Greece, the custom of meeting in councils extended into Syria and Palestine. *Euseb* Hist. Eccl. L v. c. 23. We have no certain accounts of *any* councils till after the middle of the *second* century. The earliest of which we have authentic notice, were those which deliberated concerning the *Montanists*, about A.D. 170 or 173. (*Euseb* H. E. v. 16.) and the next were those assembled to consider the proper time for *Easter*. (*Euseb* H. E. v. 23.) All these councils are placed by *Eusebius*, under the reign of *Commodus*, or A. D. 180—192. In the *third* century, councils became frequent. Provincial councils were now held, perhaps throughout the christian world; and special councils were called, as occasion required. Originally these councils had no jurisdiction; but were mere conventions of delegates, met to consider and agree upon matters of common concernment. But they soon began to claim power; to enact and enforce laws, and to hear and decide controversies. And the *bishops*, instead of appearing as the representatives of their churches, claimed authority from *Christ*, to bind and control the churches. See *W. C. Ziegler*, on the origin of Synods, in *Henkens* Neuen Magazin, Band i. St. i. *G. J. Planck's* Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschafts-Verfassung, Period ii. chap. v. vol. i. p. 90, &c. *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml. Introd. § 3, 4, and B. i. ch. i. sect. ii. p. 82, &c. ch. ii. p. 118, &c.—*Jos. Bingham*, Origines Eccles. vol. vii. p. 45, &c. and Sir *P. King*, Constitution &c. of the Prim. church, ch. 8. Tr.]

their respective countries. Hence came the *Patriarchs*; and ultimately a *Prince of Patriarchs*, the Roman Pontiff.

§ 4. No small honor and profit accrued to the whole order of men who conducted the affairs of the church, from the time they succeeded in persuading the people to regard them as *successors* of the Jewish priests. This took place not long after the reign of *Adrian*, when, upon the second destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews lost all hope of seeing their commonwealth restored. The bishops now wished to be thought to correspond with the high priests of the Jews; the *presbyters* were said to come in place of the priests: and the *deacons* were made parallel with the Levites. Those who first drew this parallel between offices so totally different, probably made the misrepresentation, not so much from design, as from ignorance. But this idea being once introduced and approved, among other errors resulting from it, I will mention only this, that it established a wider difference between teachers and learners, than accords with the nature of the christian religion.(3)

§ 5. Among the doctors of this century, whose writings rendered them particularly famous in after ages, was *Justin Martyr*; a converted philosopher, who had dipped into nearly every sect in philosophy. He was pious, and possessed considerable learning, but he was sometimes an incautious disputant, and was ignorant of ancient history. We have, among other works of his, two *Apologies* for the christians, which are justly held in great estimation.(4) *Irenaeus*, bishop of Lyons, in France, whose only re-

(3) [This comparison of christian teachers with the Jewish priesthood, among other consequences, led the former to lay claim to *tithes* and *first fruits*; of which we find mention, before the times of *Constantine*. Perhaps a desire to increase their revenues, which were both small and precarious, led some of the bishops to apply Jewish law to the christian church. That they claimed *first fruits*, as of divine right, in this century, is clear from *Irenaeus*, contra Hæres. L. iv. c. 17 and 34. That *tithes* were not yet claimed, at least in the Latin church, appears from the latter of these passages in *Irenaeus*. Yet in the Greek and oriental churches, tithes began to be claimed earlier than among the Latins; and probably in this *second* century, for the Greek writers of the *third* century, and the apostolic constitutions, (which seem to contain the ecclesiastical laws of the *Greek* church,) mention tithes as a thing then well known.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christianor. &c. p. 271. Tr.]

(4) [*Justin Martyr*, was the son of Priscus, and grandson of Bacehius, pagan Grecians, settled at Flavia Neapolis (Naples) the ancient Sichem, in Samaria. See Apolog. i. c. 1. He had successive masters in philosophy, Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and lastly Platonic. He traveled much, and was very eager in the pursuit of knowledge, and especially respecting the Divine Being. When about 23 years old, as is conjectured, and about A. D. 137, he was converted to christianity, in consequence of being directed by an aged christian, to go to the bible, as the source of true philosophy. He afterwards spent most of his time at Rome; where he lived as a christian philosopher, and devoted all his talents to the furtherance of the gospel. At last, about A. D. 164 or 167, he suffered martyrdom, one *Crescens*, a pagan philosopher, being his accuser, and on the simple charge of his being a christian. His writings are numerous, erudite, all of them theological, and all of a polemic character. His style is harsh and inelegant, his temper

maining writings are his five Books against the Hereticks; which, though preserved only in a Latin translation from the original

is ardent and decisive, and his arguments and opinions not always satisfactory. Yet being the first of the learned divines, and a very zealous and active christian, he merits our particular attention. His life and writings are described by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 11, 12, 16—18. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 23. *Photius*, Biblioth. ccxxxii. and others among the ancients; and by *Cave*, *Du Pin*, *Longerue*, *Maran*, *Milner* (Hist. of the chh. vol. I. p. 161 &c. ed. Boston, 1822) and others among the moderns.—About AD. 140, he composed two learned treatises against the pagans; *Cohortatio ad Græcos*, and *Oratio ad Græcos*. The substance of the former, which is the largest, is this: “The Greeks have no sources of certain and satisfactory knowledge of religion. What their poets state concerning the gods is ridiculous and absurd. *Jupiter*, for example, according to *Homer*, would have been incarcerated by the other gods, if they had not feared *Briareus*. And *Jupiter* himself betrayed his weakness by his amours. *Mars* and *Venus* were wounded by *Diomede*, &c. *Thales* derived all things from water; *Anaximenes*, from air; *Heraclitus*, from fire, &c. But it is not possible for the human mind to search out divine things; it needs aid from above; it must be moved by the divine Spirit, as the lyre must by the plectrum. This was the fact with the Hebrew prophets; who besides, were much older than the Grecian poets, lawgivers and philosophers. Even the heathen writers admit the high antiquity of the Jewish legislation, e. g. *Polemon*, *Appion*, *Ptolemy Mendesius*, *Helanicus*, &c. and *Philo*, *Josephus* and *Diodorus Siculus* confirm it. An Egyptian king, *Ptolemy* (Philadelphus,) therefore, caused the ancient Hebrew books to be translated into Greek, by 70 men, who were inclosed in as many separate cells: when they had finished their translations, they were found perfectly agreeing, not only in the sense but in the words. Justin himself had seen the vestiges of these cells. The Greeks derived their best thoughts from the Hebrews. Thus *Orpheus*, *Homer*, *Solon*, *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, are known to have acquired their best knowledge in Egypt. Hence, *Orpheus*, the *Sibylls*, *Homer*, *Sophocles* &c. were enabled to write about the unity of God, the judgment after death, &c. When *Plato*, for instance, says: Virtue must be given to men by the Deity; he borrowed the idea from the prophets; and to conceal the fact, he substituted *virtue* in place of the *Holy Spirit*. When he says: Time began with heaven; it is clear, that he borrowed from *Moses*’ writings, &c. Since therefore, the Grecian philosophers themselves confess their ignorance, and the *Sibylls* direct to the coming of *Christ*, men should go to the prophets, as to the source of all truth.”—The shorter work, entitled, *Oratio ad Græcos*, is similar in its contents. Indeed, this may serve as a fair specimen of the ground taken by the christian fathers generally, in their controversies with learned pagans. About AD. 150, or as some think, 10 or 12 years earlier, *Justin* presented his earliest or long *Apology* for the christians to the emperor *Antoninus Pius*: and a little before his death, or after AD. 160, his other *Apology*, an imperfect copy of which is improperly called his *first Apology*. The substance of the larger *Apology*, which is written with little method, is this: “Why are christians condemned merely for their name, without inquiry whether they are malefactors? Let this be investigated; then punish the guilty, and let the innocent go free. The christians are accused of *atheism*; but unjustly. They worship God the Father, the Son, and the prophetic or divine Spirit. They offer indeed no sacrifices: but they believe God requires none. Christians are ridiculed for expecting a kingdom of *Christ*; but unjustly. The kingdom which they expect, is not an earthly kingdom; if it were, how could they so cheerfully meet death? Christianity is not so totally unlike every thing believed by the pagans. The pagans expect a judgment after death; so do the christians. The former make *Rhadamanthus* the judge; the latter, *Jesus Christ*. The pagans believe, that many men were sons of *Jupiter*; christians believe, that *Jesus* was the Son of *God*. The pagans assert, that *Æsculapius* healed the sick in a wonderful manner; christians assert the same of *Christ*, &c. The ground of this correspondence lies in this, that the demons, who were the authors of the pagan religions, and to whom the pagan worship is paid, copied beforehand the history of *Christ*, in order to prejudice the truth. Yet they omitted to copy the *cross*, which is the appropriate sign of the power of *Christ*; (and therefore it is found indispensable in nature, e. g. in the yards of

Greek, are a splendid monument of antiquity.(5) *Athenagoras* was no contemptible philosopher; and his Apology for the chris-

a ship.) Also, by the ascent of *Simon Magus* to heaven, they sought to imitate the ascension of *Christ*: and since the Romans themselves have erected a statue to this *Simon* as a God; they should more readily do the same to *Christ*. Christianity is true. This is demonstrable from the prophecies of the Old Testament. (Here again, the antiquity of the Old Testament is asserted; and the principle maintained, that the Greeks borrowed from the Hebrews.) Also, the prophecies of *Christ*, concerning his ascension to heaven, and the destruction of Jerusalem, which have been fulfilled, prove the truth of christianity. *Christ* is the *Logos*, (the reason or intelligence) of which all men participate; so that every one who has ever lived according to *Logos*, (reason,) was a christian. The demons, whose worship is prostrated by christianity, are the authors of the persecutions against christians."—Some points in this Apology are here omitted, because contained in the other summaries.

The shorter Apology commences with an account of some persecutions; which are ascribed to the malice of the demons. It then gives reasons why christians do not shun martyrdom; and also, why God permits persecution. "God entrusted the government of the world to angels: these afterwards apostatized from God, and taking human wives, begat the demons; and by them and their offspring, the human race is now oppressed and ruined. God would, before this, have destroyed the world, had he not spared it for the sake of the christians. Yet it is to be destroyed hereafter, and by fire." *Jesus Christ* is superior to *Socrates*; for no one ever died for the doctrine of the latter. The constancy of christians under persecution is evidence of their innocence." These summaries of *Justin's* Apologies are specimens of the ground taken by all the ancient Apologists, whose works have come down to us. Besides the four works now mentioned, *Justin* wrote a book, *de Monarchia Dei*, proving the divine unity, in opposition to polytheism, by testimonies from the Old Testament, and likewise from pagan writers. The latter part of the book is preserved.—Against the Jews he composed, in the latter part of his life, his *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo*. He defends christianity against the Jews, chiefly by arguments from the ancient prophecies and types of *Christ* in the Old Testament. He also wrote a book against *Marcion*, and another against all the heresies; both of which are unfortunately lost. So are his book concerning the soul, (in which he collected the opinions of the philosophers on that subject,) and his book entitled, *Psaltes*. There are several other works now extant, under his name, which are either doubted or denied to be his: namely, an Epistle to *Diognetus*; and another to *Zenas* and *Serenus*; 146 Questions and their solutions, to the Orthodox; Exposition of the true Faith (on the Trinity); *Metaphysical Questions* (*Questiones Græcanicae*) and answers; Questions to the Greeks, and their answers refuted; a confutation of some Aristotelian doctrines, &c. *Justin's* works make a considerable folio volume. They were well edited, Paris 1636. reprinted Cologne 1686: but still better in the Benedictine ed. by *Prudent. Maran*, Paris 1742. *Thirlby's* ed. of the Dialogue, Lond. 1722 fol. is good. The two Apologies, with those of *Tertullian* and *Minutius Felix*, are given in English by *W. Reeve*, Lond. 1707. 2 vol. 8vo. Tr.]

(5) [*Irenæus*, who was active during the last half of this century, was born and educated in Asia Minor, under *Polycarp* and *Papias*. About AD. 150, *Pothinus* and others went from Asia Minor to Lyons and Vienne in France; and *Irenæus*, then a young man, is supposed to have been one of those missionaries. He remained a presbyter till the death of *Pothinus* AD. 177, when he succeeded him in the episcopal chair at Lyons, which he filled till about AD. 202, the time of his martyrdom. While a presbyter he was sent to Rome, by his church, concerning the affair of *Montanus*. He is supposed to have composed the letter written in the name of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, giving the graphic account of their persecution in AD. 177. He likewise took an active part in the controversy respecting Easter, AD. 196; and wrote to *Victor*, bishop of Rome, on the subject; and also to the presbyter *Blastus*, who was deposed at Rome during that contest. *Eusebius* has also preserved part of a letter of his to *Florinus*, an apostate to Gnosticism, with whom *Irenæus* had been intimate in his youth. Some other small works of his are mentioned by the ancients. See *Eusebius*,

tians, and his treatise on the resurrection of the body, display both learning and genius.(6) *Theophylus*, bishop of Antioch has left us three Books, addressed to one Autolycus, in defence of christianity, which are erudite but not well digested.(7) *Clemens Alex-*

Hist. Eccl. L. v. c. 15, 20, 24, 26. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. illustr. cap. 35.—But the great work of *Irenaeus*, is his Examination and Confutation of the misnamed (*γνώσις*) knowledge, in v. Books, commonly called *Libri contra Haereses*. The work is altogether polemic; and is directed particularly against *Valentinus*; yet so as to be a confutation of all the Gnostics, and a defence of the catholic faith against most of the heretics of that age. The book contains much information, respecting the early heretics, their origin, sentiments, and characters; also respecting the state of theological science in that age, the doctrines generally received and taught, and the manner of stating and defending them. But unfortunately, the original Greek is lost, except the extracts preserved by *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, and others; and the Latin translation, which is very ancient, is extremely barbarous, and sometimes scarcely intelligible.—*Irenaeus* was an ardent and sincere christian, and a discreet and amiable man. He possessed considerable learning and influence; but his mind does not appear to have been one of the highest order. As an interpreter of scripture, like all the early fathers, he was too fond of tracing allegories; and as a theologian, few of the moderns will account him entirely correct in principle, or perfectly conclusive in his reasonings.—See concerning his life and writings, *Cave*, *Du Pin*, *Massuet*, (works of *Irenaeus*,) the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. v. June, p. 335. *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tom. I. p. 51. and *Milner*, Hist. of the chh. century III. ch. i. vol I. p. 215. ed. Bost. 1822.—The best editions of his works, are, by *Grabe*, Lond. 1702, fol. and the Benedictine, by *Massuet*, Paris 1710, and Venice 1734, 2 tomi fol.—Tr.]

(6) *Athenagoras*, one of the most elegant and able writers the church has produced, is scarcely mentioned by any of the fathers. *Methodius*, about AD. 235, quoted from him; (See *Epiphan.* Hæres. 65.) *Philip Sidetes*, about AD. 400 gives some lame account of him; (in *Dodwell's* Diss. on *Irenæus* p. 408.) and *Photius* (*Bibliotheca*) in the ninth century, speaks of him. This is all the fathers tell us. It appears from the title of his Apology, that he was a christian philosopher of Athens; and that he wrote his Apology in the reign of the emperors *Marcus* and *Commodus*.—*Philip Sidetes*, who is a writer of little credit, says, he presided in the school at Alexandria, before *Pantænus*; which is contradicted by *Eusebius*; and that he was converted to christianity, by reading the scriptures with a design to confute them; which may be true. *Dr. Mosheim*, in his Diss. de vera ætate Apologetici Athenag. (Dissertt. ad Hist. Eccles. vol. i. p. 269 &c.) has proved, that the Apology was written AD. 177, the very year of the persecutions at Lyons and Vienne. *Athenagoras* descants on the same topics as *Justin Martyr*, and employs the same arguments; but his composition is immensely superior as to style and method.—His other work, de Resurrectione, is written with equal elegance, and contains the arguments used in that age, to support the doctrine of the resurrection of the body against the objections of philosophers. His works, besides being printed separately by *Edw. Dechair*, Oxford 1706, 8vo. are commonly subjoined to those of *Justin Martyr*; and the best editions are those of *Grabe*, Lond. 1802, and *Massuet*, Paris, 1710. Tr.]

(7) *Theophylus* was made bishop of Antioch in Syria, AD. 168, and died about AD. 182 or 183. The best accounts of him, by the ancients, are those of *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 20, 23. and *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 25.—He appears to have been a converted pagan, a man of reading, a decided and active christian pastor, sound in faith, and zealous for the truth. He is not metaphysical, but still is rather a dry and argumentative writer. He composed a book against *Hermogenes*; and another against *Marcion*; and a Commentary on the four Gospels: all of which are lost. His great work, and the only one which has reached us, is his three Books, addressed to his pagan friend *Autolycus*, in vindication of christianity. Here he takes much the same ground with *Justin Martyr* and the other Apologists: but he descends more into detail, in his proofs from scripture and from history. He is fond of allegorical and fanciful interpretations, and on them rests a large part of his arguments. For example: about

andrinus, a presbyter and head of the catechetic school at Alexandria, was a man of extensive reading, and especially in the works of ancient authors. This is manifest from the works of his that remain, namely, his *Stromata*, his *Paedagogus*, and *ad Graecos Exhortatio*. But he was infected with very great errors, into which he was betrayed by his excessive love of philosophy : nor are his works to be recommended as exhibiting good arrangement and perspicuity of style.(8) In the Latin language, scarce-

the middle of the second book, he makes (ἐν ἀρχῇ) *in the beginning*, Gen. i. 1. to mean, *by Christ*. The constitution by which vegetables spring up from seeds and roots, was designed to teach the resurrection of our bodies. The dry lands surrounded by seas, denote the church surrounded by enemies. The sun is a type of God ; as the moon is of man, that frail changeable creature. The three days preceding the creation of the sun and moon, (τρεῖς οἱ εἶναι ἐπιόδοι εἰς Θεόν,) are typical of the *Trinity* of God and his Word and his Wisdom. (This is said to be the earliest occurrence of the word *Trinity*, in the writings of the fathers.) The fixed stars, among which the sun moves, indicate righteous and holy men who serve God ; and the planets denote heretics and apostates, &c. &c.—Yet the work is not all of this character. It contains much that is instructive and solid ; and is written in a plain, familiar style. *Tr.*]

(8) [*Titus Flavius Clemens*, whether born at Athens or Alexandria, was a pagan in early life, and devoted himself to philosophy. He travelled in Greece, in south Italy, in Coelo-Syria, in Palestine, and lastly in Egypt, where he was a pupil of *Pantaenus* the master of the christian school at Alexandria. Becoming a christian he was made a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and succeeded his preceptor *Pantaenus*, as master of the catechetic or divinity school. He taught with great applause during the reign of *Severus*, (AD. 193—211,) and had *Origen* and other eminent men of the third century, for pupils.—About AD. 202, he retired into Palestine and Syria, for a short time, to avoid persecution. He is supposed to have died about AD. 220.—*Clement* had vast learning, a lively imagination, great fluency, considerable discrimination, and was a bold and independent speculator. That he had true piety, and held the essential truths of the Gospel, is admitted by all ; but no one of the fathers, except *Origen*, has been more censured in modern times, for an excessive attachment to philosophy or metaphysical theology. He was a true *Eclectic*, which he also professed to be ; that is, he followed no master implicitly, but examined and judged for himself. Yet his education and the atmosphere in which he lived, led him to lean towards Platonism and Stoicism. His great error was, that he overrated the value of philosophy, or human reason, as a guide in matters of religion. He also indulged his imagination, as all the learned of his age did, to excess ; and construed the bible allegorically, and fancifully.—His three principal works, which have reached us, constitute one whole. His *Exhortatio ad Græcos* was intended to convince and convert pagans. It exposes the nakedness of polytheism, and demonstrates the truth and excellence of christianity. His *Paedagogus*, in iii. Books, was intended to instruct a young convert in the practice of christianity. It is an indifferent performance, dwells much on trivial rules of conduct, and does not go to the bottom even of external morality. His *Stromata*, in viii. Books, (the last of which is not the genuine 8th Book,) are written without method, or in a most discursive manner. In them *Clement* attempts to give the world his most profound thoughts and speculations on theology, and the kindred sciences.—He has also left us a practical treatise, entitled *Quis dives ille sit, qui salvetur* ; in which his object is to show to what temptations and dangers the *rich* are exposed. There are ascribed to him, and printed with his works, Extracts from the writings of *Theodotus* and the oriental philosophy, (the contents of some one's note book, respecting the Gnostics,) ; and selections from the Prophets, (of no great value) ; which may be taken from the loose papers of *Clement*, yet are dubious.—*Eusebius* and *Jerome* mention works of his, which are now lost. Of these the principal, are *Libri viii. Hypotyposeon*, a compendious exposition of the O. and N. Testament. The others were tracts ; *de Paschate*, *de Jejunio*, *de Obsecratione*

ly any one in this century illustrated or defended the christian religion, except *Tertullian*. He was at first, a jurisconsult, then a presbyter at Carthage, and at last a follower of *Montanus*. We have various short works of his, which aim either to explain and defend the truth, or to excite piety. Which were the greatest, his excellencies or his defects, it is difficult to say. He possessed great genius; but it was wild and unchastened. His piety was active and fervent; but likewise gloomy and austere. He had much learning and knowledge; but lacked discretion and judgment: he was more acute than solid.(9)

Exhortatio ad Patientiam, and *Canon Ecclesiasticus*, or *de Canonibus Ecclesiasticis*.—The character and writings of *Clement*, have been elaborately investigated by various persons, among whom are *N. le Nourry* (*Apparat. ad Biblioth. Patr.*)—*J. G. Walch* (*Miscellanea Sacra.*) *J. Brucker* (*Hist. crit. pilos.*) and *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i.—The best edition of his works, is that of *Potter*, Oxon. 1715. Fol. Tr.]

(9) Those who wish further information concerning these writers, their defects and their works, are directed,—and the direction is given once for all,—to consult those authors, who treat professedly of the Ecclesiastical Writers; namely, *J. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, and *Biblioth. Latina*. *W. Care*, *Historia Litteraria Scriptor. Eccles.* *L. Ellies du Pin* and *Remigius Cellier*, in their *Bibliothecas* of Eccles. Writers in French; and others.

[*Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus* was the son of a pagan centurian of proconsular rank, and born at Carthage about AD. 160. He was bred to the law; but becoming a christian, was made a presbyter in the church of Carthage, where he appears to have spent his whole life. About AD. 200, he embraced the sentiments of the Montanists; which he afterwards defended with his usual ardor. He is said to have lived to a great age; and yet he is supposed to have died about AD. 220.—*Jerome*, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 53. *Eusebius*, *Chronicon.* ann. 16 Severi, and others, give him a high character. *Jerome* tells us, that *Cyprian* bp. of Carthage was accustomed to read some portions of his works daily; and in calling for this author, used to say: *Da magistrum, bring my master*. He wrote with great force, and displayed much both of erudition and acuteness; but his style is concise, harsh, and extremely difficult for modern readers. His diction and his spirit too, it has been supposed, were extensively propagated in the Latin church.—His works consist of about 30 short treatises, and are nearly all of a polemic cast, argumentative, vituperative, and severe. They may be divided into three classes; namely, *apologetic*, or in controversy with pagans and Jews;—*doctrinal*, or confutations of heretics;—and *moral*, in defence or confutation of certain practices or rules of conduct.—Of the *first* class are his *Apologeticum*, and *ad Nationes Libri ii.* These are only different editions of the same work: and were composed about AD. 198.—*de Testimonio animæ*; the testimony of conscience or common sense to the truths maintained by christians:—*ad Scapulam*, a pagan magistrate; an expostulation with him, (AD. 211.)—*adversus Judaeos*; proving from the O. T. that *Jesus* was the Messiah, and christianity true.—In all these, he takes the same ground with *Justin Martyr* and the other apologists of that age.—Of the *second* or *doctrinal* class, are: *de Baptismo*; against one *Quintilla*, who rejected baptism altogether: *de Præscriptionibus hæreticorum*; a confutation of all heresies collectively, on general principles: *Libri v. adv. Marcionem*, (AD. 207.) and single books against the *Valentinians*, *Praxeas* and *Hermogenes*:—*Scorpiace*, or *Scorpiacum*, *adv. Gnosticos*, or *de bono martyrii*; that is, an Antidote against the Scorpions, i. e. the Gnostics, who have no martyrs among them: *de Carne Christi*; that *Christ* truly died on the cross; maintained against the Docetæ: *de Resurrectione*; of the same tenor with the last: *de Anima*; against the philosophers; their notions of the soul confuted.—In attacking the heretics, he takes much the same ground with *Irenæus*.—Most of his works of the *third* class, were written after he became a Montanist, and are in defence of the rigid principles of that sect, or in opposition to the opinions and practice of christians in general. The two first, however, were written in

his early life, and are of a different character: viz. *de Oratione*; on prayer in general, and the Lord's prayer in particular: *Liber ad Martyres*; designed to comfort and animate them in their dying moments: *de Spectaculis*, and *de Idololatria*; warnings to christians against attending theatres, and other idolatrous rites: *Libri ii. ad uxorem*; warning her against a second marriage, if she should become a widow; and especially against marrying a pagan:—*de Pœnitentia*; on penance and humiliation for sin: *de Patientia*.—All the preceding of this class, were probably written before he became an avowed Montanist:—*de corona militis*; justifying and commending a soldier who refused a military crown, and was punished for it:—*de velandis virginibus*; against the custom of the young ladies appearing abroad unveiled:—*de habitu muliebri*; reprehension of the ladies for their attention to dress: *de Cultu sceminarum*; much the same;—on their adorning their persons: *de Fuga in persecutione*; that no one should retire for safety in time of persecution: *Exhortatio Castitatis*, and *de Monogamia*; two tracts on the same subject; namely, the criminality of second marriages: *de Jejuniis adv. Psychicos*; against the orthodox, in defence of the Montanist principles about fasting: *de Pudicitia*; that offenders, especially by unchastity, should never be restored to communion in the church: *de Pallio*; against wearing the Roman toga, and recommending in place of it, the Grecian pallium or cloak.—These are all the works of Tertullian, which have reached us. Among his lost works, were seven Books in defense of the Montanists; one, on the Believer's hope; one, on Paradise; and one, on Aaron's garments. The best editions of his works, are, by *Rigaltius*, Paris 1634 and 1641. Fol. and by *Semler*, Halle 1769—73, 5 vol. 8vo. with a 6th vol. by *Windorf*, containing indices and a Glossary; 1776.

Besides the writers above mentioned, whose works have been preserved, there were many others in this century, of whose works we have only extracts preserved by the fathers. Of these, a catalogue embracing such as are mentioned by *Eusebius* in his *Eccles. History*, and by *Jerome*, *de Scriptoribus Illustribus*, is here subjoined.

Papias, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, cotemporary with *Ignatius*, in the beginning of the century. He wrote five Books, containing traditional accounts of *Christ*, his apostles, and others of the primitive times. He is said to have advocated the doctrine of the Millennium. *Euseb. iii. 39, Jerome, c. 18.*

Quadratus, bp. of Athens. He wrote an Apology for the christians, presented to the emperor *Adrian*, AD. 123 or 131. *Euseb. iv. 3. Jerome, c. 19.*

Aristides, an eloquent christian philosopher of Athens, at the same time presented an Apology. *Euseb. iv. 3. Jerome, c. 20.*

Agrippa Castor, cotemporary with the two last. He was "a very learned man," and wrote a confutation of the 24 Books of *Basilides* the heretic. *Euseb. iv. 7. Jerome, c. 21.*

Hegesippus, a converted Jew, who resided at Corinth and at Rome. He wrote about AD. 160, five Books of *Eccles. Memoires*, from the crucifixion of *Christ* to his own times. *Euseb. iv. 8, 22. and iii. 19, 20, 32. Jerome, c. 22.*

Melito, bp. of Sardis. He wrote an Apology, besides various short works; namely, *de Pascha* (the time of Easter); *de Vita Prophetarum*; *de Ecclesia*; *de Die Dominica*; *de Sensibus*; *de Fide*; *de Plasmate*; *de anima et corpore*; *de Baptismate*; *de Veritate*; *de Generatione Christi*; *de Prophetia*; *de Philoxenia*; a book entitled *Clavis*; *de Diabolo*, *de Apocalypse Joannis*, *de Corporali Deo*. *Euseb. iv. 26. Jerome, c. 24.*

Apollinaris, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, AD 170. He wrote an Apology; five books against the pagans; *de Veritate Libri ii.*; *adv. Cataphrygas*; *adv. Judæos Libri ii.* *Euseb. iv. 27. Jerome, c. 16.*

Dionysius, bp. of Corinth, from about AD. 170. He was an active and influential man, and wrote valuable Epistles to several churches and their bishops; namely, to the churches of Sparta, Athens, Nicomedia, Gortyna and others in Crete, Amastris and others in Pontus; and to *Pinitus* a Cretan bp. and *Victor*, bp. of Rome. *Euseb. iv. 23. Jerome, c. 27.*

Tatian, a rhetorician, and disciple of *Justin Martyr*. After the death of *Justin*, he swerved from the common path, and became founder of a rigorous sect called Encratites. He flourished about AD. 170, and wrote an Apology, under the title of *Oratio contra Græcos*, which is still extant, and usually printed with the works of *Justin Martyr*. He is said to have composed many other works; among which a *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the four Gospels, and a treatise on Perfection af-

ter the pattern of *Christ*, are particularly mentioned. *Euseb.* iv. 29. *Jerome*, c. 29. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. iii. 12.

Musanus, of the same age, wrote against the Encratites, *Jerome*, c. 31. *Euseb.* iv. 28.

Modestus, of the same age, wrote a book against *Marcion*, which *Eusebius* says, exceeded all other confutations of that heretic. *Euseb.* iv. 25. *Jerome* c. 32.

Bardesanes, a Syrian of Edessa, of the same age, an eloquent and acute reasoner. He was first a Valentinian; but afterwards, wrote against that and other sects. His works were numerous, which his admirers translated from Syriac into Greek. His dialogues against *Marcion*, and his treatise on Fate, are particularly commended. *Euseb.* iv. 30. *Jerome*, c. 33.

Victor, bp. of Rome AD. 194—203. His zeal respecting the right day for Easter, led him to write several Epistles on that subject. *Euseb.* v. 24. *Jerome*, c. 34. Nothing of his remains; though two spurious Epistles with his name, are still extant.

Pantænus, a christian philosopher of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, before *Clement*. He was a learned and active christian; and wrote much, particularly in explanation of the scriptures; but none of his works remain. He visited India, or Arabia Felix, as a missionary, and had vast influence in the church. *Euseb.* v. 10. *Jerome*, c. 36.

Rhodon, an Asiatic Greek, but educated at Rome under *Tatian*. He wrote much; and in particular, on the Hexæmeron (the six days of creation;) a treatise against *Marcion*; and another against the Phrygians or Cataphrygians, the disciples of *Montanus*. *Euseb.* v. 13. *Jerome*, c. 37.

Miltiades, who flourished in the reign of *Commodus* AD. 180—192. He wrote an Apology; a work against the Cataphrygians; two Books against the pagans; and two others against the Jews. *Euseb.* v. 17. *Jerome*, c. 39.

Apollonius, an eloquent Greek writer, author of a long and much valued confutation of the Cataphrygians. *Euseb.* v. 18. *Jerome*, c. 40.

Scrapion, ordained bp. of Antioch AD. 191. He wrote an Epistle concerning the Montanists or Cataphrygians; another to *Domninus*, an apostate to Judaism; and a tract concerning the spurious Gospel ascribed to *Peter*. *Euseb.* vi. 12. *Jerome*, c. 41.

Apollonius, a Roman senator and martyr under *Commodus*. His eloquent defence at his trial, was committed to writing. *Euseb.* v. 21. *Jerome*, c. 42.

Under the reigns of *Commodus* and *Severus*, or AD. 180—211. lived several writers, mentioned summarily by *Euseb.* v. 27. and by *Jerome* c. 46—51: namely, *Heracitus*, author of a Commentary on Paul's Epistles; *Maximus*, who wrote on the Origin of Evil and the Creation of Matter; *Candidus* and *Appion*, who wrote on the Hexæmeron (Gen. ch. i.); *Sextus* wrote on the Resurrection; and *Arabianus* composed some doctrinal tracts.

All the preceding wrote in Greek, except *Bardesanes* who composed in Syriac, and *Victor* and *Apollonius* the martyr, who wrote in Latin. *Tr.]*

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Religion yet simple.—§ 2. Was gradually changed.—§ 3. This proved by an example.—§ 4. Attention to the scriptures.—§ 5. Faults of interpreters.—§ 6. State of dogmatic theology.—§ 7. Polemics of this age.—§ 8. Excellencies and defects of the controversialists.—§ 9. Writers on practical religion.—§ 10. Merits of the fathers in regard to practical religion.—§ 11. Twofold system of practical religion.—§ 12. Hence the Ascetics.—§ 13. Causes of their rise.—§ 14. Their progress.—§ 15. Origin of pious frauds.—§ 16. A christian life, and the discipline of offenders.—§ 17. Public penitence modeled according to the rules of the pagan mysteries.

§ 1. The whole christian system was still comprised in a few precepts and propositions ; nor did the teachers publicly advance any doctrines besides those contained in what is called the *Apostles' creed*. In their manner of handling these doctrines, there was nothing subtle, profound, or distant from common apprehension. This will not appear strange, if we reflect that no controversy had yet been moved, respecting those important points of religion about which contests afterwards arose, and that the bishops were generally plain, unlearned men, more distinguished for their piety than for their genius and eloquence.

§ 2. Yet insensibly, from this venerable simplicity, there was a considerable departure ; many points were more critically investigated, and more artificially stated ; many principles also were imprudently adopted, which were derived from philosophy, and that too, not of the most solid character. This change arose from two principal causes. The first lay in the disposition of certain teachers, who wished to make christianity appear in harmony with the decisions of philosophy, and who thought it elegant to state christian precepts in the language of philosophers, civilians, and rabbins. The other cause is found in the discussions with the opposers and corrupters of the truth. To meet these the christian doctors were sometimes under a necessity, to state with precision what was before undefined, and to exhibit their views with more discrimination.

§ 3. Whoever wishes for an example, need only consider what began to be taught in this age respecting the state of souls when separated from the body. *Jesus* and his apostles simply taught, that the spirits of holy men on leaving the body were received to heaven : and that those of the wicked went to hell. And this satisfied the first disciples of *Christ*, in whom there was more piety than curiosity. But this plain doctrine was materially injured, when christians were induced to agree with the Platonics and oth-

ers, that only the souls of heroes and men of distinguished abilities, were raised to heaven; while those of others, being weighed down by their sensual propensities, sunk to the infernal regions, and could never attain to the world of light till cleansed from their pollutions.(1) From the time that this opinion began to prevail, the *martyrs* only were represented and believed to be happy, immediately after death, and others were assigned to some obscure region, in which they were detained till the second coming of *Christ*, or at least, till their impurities which disqualified them for heaven should be removed from them. From this source how numerous and how vast the errors?—what vain ceremonies?—what monstrous superstitions took their rise?

§ 4. But they all revered the holy scriptures, as the rule of faith and the standard of truth; and therefore they wished them to be in the hands of all. Of the translations of the scriptures into other languages, we have already spoken. We shall here speak only of the expositors. The first christian who composed explanations of the sacred volume, was, if I mistake not, *Pantænus*, the master of the Alexandrine school. But divine providence has so ordered, that none of his writings have reached us. The *Hypotyposes*, also, of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in which he is said to have expounded detached passages from all the sacred books, have been lost; and likewise his *Commentaries on the canonical Epistles*. *Tatian* composed a *Harmony of the Gospels*, which has [not] escaped the ravages of time.(2) *Justin Martyr* explained the *Apocalypse*; *Theophilus* of Antioch elucidated the *four Gospels*; and [many] others expounded the Mosaic account of the creation. All these works are now lost.

§ 5. But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They all believed the language of scripture to contain *two meanings*, the one *obvious* and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other *recondite* and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell; and the former they neglected, as being of little value, and bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings, by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meaning. Some also, and this is sta-

(1) I have treated largely of these sentiments of the ancients and especially of the Platonics, in my notes on *R. Cudworth's Intellectual System*. tom. ii. p. 1036.

(2) [I cannot but think there must be a great typographical error in the original of this sentence. For it is not easy to believe, that *Dr. Mosheim* held to the long exploded notion, that either of those Harmonies of the four Gospels, which we have in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, could be the genuine work of *Tatian*. See *Prudentius Maran*, Diss. xiii. cap. xii. § 5, 6. prefixed to his edition of *Justin Martyr* &c. and republished by *Sprenger*, *Thesaurus Rei Patristicæ*, tom. ii. Tr.]

ted especially of *Clement*, attempted to make the divine oracles teach and support the precepts of philosophy. The excessive and almost divine authority ascribed to the Alexandrine version of the O. Testament, called the Septuagint, was a great obstacle to any valuable and suitable interpretation of that part of the bible.

§ 6. A system of christian theology, so far as we can learn, was composed by no one in this age. The tracts of *Arabianus*, de dogmate Christiano, having been all lost, we cannot tell what they were. The five Books of *Papias*, de Dictis Christi et Apostolorum, or, Explanatio oraculorum dominicorum, so far as can be learned from *Eusebius*,⁽³⁾ must be regarded rather as a historical than a doctrinal work. *Melito* of Sardis is said to have written, de Fide, de Creatione, and de Veritate: but it does not appear from these titles, whether they were polemic or doctrinal treatises. Some points in theology were stated and defended, by those who engaged in religious controversies. But the doctrines which were not brought into controversy, were not so distinctly treated by the writers of that age, that we can fully understand what their views were. It is therefore not strange, that all sects of christians can find in what are called the *Fathers*, something to favor their own opinions and systems.

§ 7. The controversial writers who distinguished themselves in this century, encountered either the *Jews*, or the *worshippers of idol gods*, or the corrupters of the christian doctrine and founders of new sects, that is, the *heretics*. With the *Jews*, contended in particular *Justin Martyr*, in his dialogue with Trypho; and likewise *Tertullian*; but neither of them, in the best manner; because they were not acquainted with the language and history of the Hebrews, and did not duly consider the subject. The *pagans* were assailed especially, by those who wrote *Apologies* for the christians; as *Athenagoras*, *Melito*, *Quadratus*, *Miltiades*, *Aristides*, *Tatian*, and *Justin Martyr*; or who composed *Addresses to the pagans*; as *Justin*, *Tertullian*, *Clement*, and *Theophilus* of Antioch. All these vanquished paganism, and answered the calumnies cast upon the christians, solidly and dexterously; but they were less able and successful in explaining the nature of the christian religion, and demonstrating its truth and divine origin. At least, we perceive that much is wanting in the explanations they give of christian doctrines, and in the arguments they use in confirmation of religious truth. Those who chastised the *heretics*, make a numerous body; but we have few of their writings left. The whole host of *heretics* were attacked by *Irenaeus* in a work expressly against them; by *Clement* in his *Stromata*; and by *Tertullian*, de Præscriptionibus adversus hæreti-

(3) [*Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 29. See also *Irenæus*, adv. Hæres. L. v. c. 33. *Jerome*, de Scriptoribus Illustr. cap. 18. Tr.]

cos ; not to mention *Justin Martyr*, whose confutation of them has been lost. Those who wrote against particular sects of heretics, it would be tedious to enumerate ; besides, the works of most of them are not preserved.

§ 8. In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry and the dishonorable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among christians. Yet a man of sound judgment who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lacked discernment, knowledge, application, good arrangement and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as were suited rather to embarrass the mind than to convince the understanding. One, laying aside the divine scriptures, from which all the weapons of religious controversy should be drawn, bids us consult the bishops of those churches which were founded by apostles. Another, as if contending about the title or boundaries of lands in a court of law, with an ill grace pleads *prescription* against his adversaries. A third imitates the silly disputants among the Jews, who offered as arguments the mystic powers of numbers and words.(3) Nor are those wholly in error, who think that the vicious mode of disputing which afterwards obtained the name of *oeconomical*, was sometimes used even in this century.(4)

§ 9. The principal parts of practical religion or morality, are treated of by *Justin Martyr*, or whoever it was that composed the *Epistle to Zenas and Serenus*, found among the works of Justin. Others took up particular duties in set treatises. Thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* composed tracts on *Calumny*, *Patience*, *Continence* and other virtues ; which have not escaped the ravages of time. But the tracts of *Tertullian* on practical duties, namely, on *Chastity*, on *Flight from persecution*, on *Fasting*, on *Theatrical exhibitions*, on the *Dress of females*, on *Prayer*, &c. have come safely to our hands ; and would be perused with greater profit, were it not for the gloomy and morose spirit which they every where breathe, and the excessively artificial and difficult style in which they are written.

§ 10. In what estimation these and other ancient writers on christian morals ought to be held, the learned are not agreed. Some hold them to be the very best guides to true piety and a holy life ; others on the contrary, think their precepts were the worst

(3) Examples may be seen in *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire des Juifs*, tome iii. p. 660, 694.

(4) *R. Simon*, *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* cap. ii. p. 21. [To do, or to say any thing, κατ' οἰκονομίαν, or οἰκονομικῶς, is to use deception or good policy, rather than fair, honest dealing ; yet with good intentions, or for a good end. See *Suicer*, *Thesaur. Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 459. Tr.]

possible, and that the cause of practical religion could not be committed to worse hands.(5) Competent judges will decide the question for themselves. To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle pious emotions; but also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the Stoic and Academic philosophy; many things vague and indeterminate; and many things positively false, and inconsistent with the precepts of *Christ*. If one deserves the title of a bad master in morals, who has no just ideas of the proper boundaries and limitations of christian duties, nor clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor a perception of those general principles to which recurrence should be had in all discussions respecting christian virtue, and therefore very often talks at random, and blunders in expounding the divine laws; though he may say many excellent things and excite in us considerable emotion; then I can readily admit that in strict truth, this title belongs to many of the *Fathers*.

§ 11. In this century there was admitted, with good intentions no doubt, yet most inconsiderately, a great error in regard to morals, and pernicious to christianity; an error, which through all succeeding ages to our times, has produced an infinity of mistakes and evils of various kinds. *Jesus* our Savior, prescribed one and the *same* rule of life or duty to all his disciples. But the christian doctors, either by too great a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or from a natural propensity to austerity and gloom, (which is a disease that many labor under in Syria, Egypt and other provinces of the East,) were induced to maintain that *Christ* had prescribed a *twofold rule of holiness and virtue*; the one ordinary, the other extraordinary; the one lower, the other higher; the one for men of business, the other for persons of leisure, and such as sought to attain higher glory in the

(5) On this subject in our day, the learned and ingenious *Jo. Barbeyrac* held a controversy with *Remigius Cœtier*, a Benedictine monk. A history of the controversy, with his own opinion of it is given by *J. F. Buddeus*, *Isagege ad Theologiam*, Lib. ii. cap. iv. § iv. p. 553 &c. Afterwards *Barbeyrac* published a more full defence of the severe judgment he had passed upon the *Fathers*, under the title of *Traité de la Morale des Peres*, Amsterdam, 1728, 4to. which is well worth reading by those who wish to investigate the subject; yet I think, he charges the *Fathers* with some faults, which may easily be excused. [*Liberatus Fassonius*, a Catholic, published an answer to *Barbeyrac*, in a Latin work, *de morali Patrum doctrina*, adv. Librum *Jo. Barbeyraci*, Liburnici 1767. 4to. *Fassonius* excuses the *Fathers* for the following opinions, charged upon them as errors by *Barbeyrac*; namely, that they condemned taking interest for money loaned; placed too high a value on virginity, and accounted celibacy a more holy state than matrimony; forbid husbands sleeping with their wives while pregnant; deemed it unsuitable for clergymen to marry, and excluded from the ministry such as married a second time;—commended a monastic life; made two systems of duty, one for the more perfect, and another for common christians;—and held it lawful to persecute heretics with fire and sword. Most of the other faults charged on the *Fathers* by *Barbeyrac*, *Fassonius* maintains, should be charged solely on the heretics. *Tr.*]

future world. They therefore early divided all that had been taught, whether in books or by tradition, respecting a christian life and morals, into *Precepts* and *Counsels*. They applied the name *Precepts* to those laws which were universally obligatory, or were enacted for all men of all descriptions ; but the *Counsels* related only to those who deemed it praiseworthy to aspire after superior holiness and a closer union with God.

§ 12. There soon arose a class of persons, who professed to strive after that higher and more eminent holiness, than common christians can attain ; and who resolved to obey the *counsels* of *Christ*, in order to enjoy intimate communion with God in this life, and on leaving the body to rise without impediment or difficulty to the celestial world. They supposed many things were forbidden to them, which were allowed to other christians ; such as wine, flesh, matrimony and worldly business.(6) They supposed they must emaciate their bodies with watching, fasting, toil and hunger. They considered it a happiness to retire to desert places, and by close meditation to abstract their minds from all external objects and whatever delights the senses. Both men and women imposed these severe restraints on themselves with good intentions, I suppose, but setting a bad example, and greatly to the injury of the cause of christianity. They were of course denominated *Ascetics*, Σαδαιῖται, Ἐκλεκτοί, and also *philosophers* ; and were distinguished from other christians, not only by a different appellation, but by peculiarities of dress and demeanor.(7) Those of this century, who embraced this austere mode of life, lived indeed only for themselves, but they did not withdraw themselves altogether from the society and converse of men. But in process of time, persons of this description retired into deserts, and afterwards formed themselves into secluded associations after the manner of the *Essenes* and *Therapeutae*.

§ 13. The causes of this institution are at hand. First, the christians did not like to appear inferior to the Greeks, the Romans, and the other people ; among whom there were many philosophers and sages, who were distinguished from the vulgar by their dress and their whole mode of life, and who were held in high honor. Now among these philosophers, (as is well known,) none better pleased the christians than the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* ; who, it appears recommended *two* modes of living, the one for philosophers who wished to excel others in virtue, and the other for people engaged in the common affairs of life.(8)

(6) *Athenagoras*, Apologia pro Christianis, cap. 28. p. 129. ed. Oxon. and others.

(7) See *C. Salmasius*, Comment. in Tertullian. de Pallio, p. 7. 8. [*Sam. Deyling*, Exercit. de Ascetis Vet. in Observ. Sacr. L. iii. and *Jos. Bingham*, Antiq. Eccles. vol. iii. p. 3. &c. Tr.]

(8) They made a distinction between living according to nature, ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν,) and living above nature (ζῆν ὑπὲρ φύσιν.) See *Aeneas Gazaeus*, in Theo-

The Platonists prescribed the following rule for philosophers : The mind of a wise man must be withdrawn, as far as possible, from the contagious influence of the body. And as the oppressive load of the body, and intercourse with men, are most adverse to this design ; therefore, all sensual gratifications are to be avoided ; the body is to be sustained, or rather mortified, with coarse and slender fare ; solitude is to be sought for ; and the mind is to be self-collected, and absorbed in contemplation, so as to be detached as much as possible from the body.(9) Whoever lives in this manner, shall in the present life have converse with God ; and, when freed from the load of the body, shall ascend without delay to the celestial mansions, and not need, like the souls of other men to undergo a purgation. The grounds of this system lay in the peculiar sentiments entertained by this sect of philosophers and by their friends, respecting the *soul*, *demons*, *matter*, and the *universe*. And when these sentiments were embraced by the christian philosophers, the necessary consequences of them must be adopted of course.

§ 14. What has been stated will excite less surprise, if it be remembered, that *Egypt* was the land where this mode of life had its origin. For this country from some law of nature, has always produced a greater number of gloomy and hypochondriac or melancholy persons than any other ;(10) and it still does so. Here it was, that long before the Savior's birth, not only the *Essenes* and *Therapeutae*,—those Jewish sects, composed of persons affected with a morbid melancholy, or rather partially deranged,—had their chief residence ; but many others also, that they might better please the gods, withdrew themselves as by the instinct of nature from commerce with men and from all the pleasures of life.(11) From Egypt, this mode of life passed into Syria and the neighboring countries ; which in like manner, always abounded with unsociable and austere individuals :(12) and at last it was introduced from the East among the nations of Europe. Hence the numerous maladies which still deform the christian world ; hence the celibacy of the clergy ; hence the numerous herds of monks ; hence the two species of life, the *theoretical*

phrasto, p. 29. ed. *Barthii*. The former was the rule for *all* men ; the latter, only for philosophers who aimed at perfect virtue.

(9) Consult here, by all means, that most distinguished Platonist, *Porphyry*, *περὶ ἀποχρῆς*, or, *on Abstinence from flesh*, Lib. i. § 27 and 41. p. 22, 34. where he formally lays down rules for these duties of a philosopher.

(10) See *Bened. Maillet*, *Description d'Égypte*, tome ii. p. 57. &c. Paris, 1735. 4to.

(11) *Herodotus*, *Historiar.* Lib. ii. p. 104. ed. Gronov. *Epiphanius*, *Expos. fidei*, § 11. Opp. tom. ii. p. 1092. *Tertullian*, *de Exhortatione castitatis*, cap 13. *Athanasius*, *Vita Antonii*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 453.

(12) *Jo Chardin*, *Voyages in Perse*, tome iv. p. 197. ed. Amsterd. 1735. 4to.

and *mystical*; hence the many other things of a like nature, which we shall have occasion to mention in the progress of our work.

§ 15. Another error among the christians, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one, and productive of many evils, was the following. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful but commendable to deceive and to lie, for the sake of truth and piety.(13) The Jews living in Egypt, learned from them this sentiment before the christian era, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread among the christians. Of this no one will doubt, who calls to mind the numerous forgeries of books under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses,(14) and other similar trash,(15) a large mass of which appeared in this and the following centuries. I would not say, that the orthodox christians forged all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the *Gnostic* sects. Yet, that the christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.

§ 16. The more the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the greater the number of vicious and bad men who thrust themselves into it; as may be proved by the many complaints and censures of the writers of this age. The well known custom of excluding transgressors from the communion, was a barrier against the more flagrant and notorious crimes. Of all sins, those accounted the most heinous and the greatest, were these three, *murder, idolatry, and adultery*; which terms however, must here be understood in the broadest sense. Those guilty of these

(13) [*Mosheim*, on this subject, in his *Comment. de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 231. refers us to his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicas ecclesia*, § 41 &c. *Tr.*]

(14) [Concerning the Sibylline verses, which were composed about AD. 138, *J. A. Fabricius* has treated largely, *Biblioth. Graeca.* tom. i. The latest editor of the verses, is *Servat. Gallaeus*, who has corrected the text, and added copious notes, *Amsterd.* 1689. 4to. He has subjoined the Magic Oracles ascribed to *Zoroaster* and others; in which are many things of christian origin. That the Sibylline verses were fabricated by some christian, in order to bring idolaters to believe in the truth of christianity, has been well shewn by *David Blondell*, among others; and with a very few exceptions, there is no learned man at the present day, who thinks otherwise. *Blondell's* work which is in French, was first published under the title: *Des Sibylles célébrées tant par l'Antiquité payenne, que par les saints Peres*, Charenton, 1649. 4to. Two years after, the title was changed; doubtless to allure purchasers; *Traite, de la Creance des Peres touchant l'Etat des ames apres cette vie, &c. à l'occasion de l'Ecrit attribue aux Sibylles*, Charenton, 1651. 4to.—That the pagans were indignant at this forgery, which they attributed to the christians, appears from *Origen*, *contra Celsum*, Lib. v. p. 272. ed *Spencer*, *Lactantius*, *Instit. Divinor.* L. iv. c. 14; and *Constantine the Great*, *Oratio ad Sanctos*, in *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* See *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 230. *Tr.*]

(15) [That the books now circulated under the name of *Hermes*, and particularly the one called *Poëmander*, were a christian forgery, was first shewn by *Is. Casaubon*, *Exercit.* 1. in *Baronium*, § 18. p. 54. and afterwards by *H. Conringius*, *Beausabre*, *Cudworth*, *Warburton*, and many others. Some however, suppose the books were originally composed by Platonists; and afterwards interpolated and corrupted by some christian. See *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christ.* p. 230. *Tr.*]

crimes, were in many churches cut off forever from communion ; in other churches, they were received back after a long, severe and painful probation.(16)

It is worthy of particular notice, that this custom of excluding bad characters from the society of christians, and of not receiving them back except upon full proof of reformation, was at first a simple process, or attended with very little formality ; but by degrees, the regulations for it were greatly amplified, and deformed by many rites borrowed especially from the discipline of the pagan mysteries.(17) That it was proper for the christian bishops to increase the restraints upon the licentiousness of transgression, will be readily granted by all who consider the circumstances of those times. But whether it was for the advantage of christianity, to borrow rules for this salutary ordinance from the enemies of the truth, and thus to consecrate as it were, a part of the pagan superstition, many persons very justly call in question. The more candid will appreciate the good *intention* of those who introduced this sort of rules and ceremonies ; all beyond this, they will ascribe to human weakness.

(16) In this manner I think, we may reconcile the different opinions of learned men on this subject. See *Jo. Morin*, de *Disciplina poenitentiae*, Lib. ix. cap. 19. p. 670 &c. *Ja. Sirmond*, *Historia poenitentiae publicae*, cap. i. Opp. tom. iv. p. 323. and the recent Dissertation of *Jo. Aug. Orsi*, de *Criminum capitalium per tria priora saecula absolutione*, Mediolani 1730 4to.

17) See *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, *Bibliographiae Antiquariae*, p. 397. *Jo. Morin*, de *Poenitentia*, Lib. i. cap. 15, 16. &c.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Ceremonies much increased.—§ 2. Reasons; I. a desire to enlarge the church.—§ 3. II. Hope that they would silence calumnies.—§ 4. III. Abuse of Jewish terms.—§ 5. IV. Imitation of the pagan mysteries.—§ 6. V. Mode of instructing by symbols.—§ 7. VI. Habits of the converts.—§ 8. The assemblies for worship.—§ 9. Contests about the time for Easter.—§ 10. Their importance.—§ 11. The Asiatics and the Romans, the principal parties.—§ 12. Celebration of the Lord's supper.—§ 13. Baptism.

§ 1. It is certain, that to religious worship both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offence of sober and good men.(1) The principal cause of this, I readily look for in the perverseness of mankind; who are more delighted with the pomp and splendor of external forms and pageantry, than with the true devotion of the heart, and who despise whatever does not gratify their eyes and ears.(2) But other and additional causes may be mentioned; which, though they suppose no bad design, yet clearly betray indiscretion.

§ 2. *First*, there is good reason to suppose, the christian bishops multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and the pagans more friendly to them. For both these had been accustomed to numerous and splendid ceremonies from their infancy, and had no doubts that they constituted an essential part of religion. And when they saw the new religion to be destitute of such ceremonies, they thought it too simple, and therefore despised it. To obviate this objection, the rulers of the christian churches deemed it proper for them to be more formal and splendid in their public worship.(3)

(1) *Tertullian*, Liber de creatione, Opp. p. 792 &c.

(2) [To illustrate the influence of splendid ceremonies on mankind, Dr. *Mac-laine* here states; that, "The late Lord *Bolingbroke*, being present at the elevation of the host in the cathedral at Paris, expressed to a nobleman who stood near him, his surprise, that the *king* of France should commit the performance of such an august and striking ceremony to *any subject*." *Tr.*]

(3) It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here, a very apposite passage, which I accidentally met with, in *Gregory Nissen's* life of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, in the Works of Thaumaturgus, as published by *Vossius*, p. 312. who gives the Latin only: Cum animadvertisset (*Gregorius*), quod ob corporeas delectationes et voluptates simplex et imperitum vulgus in simulacrorum cultus errore permaneret—permisit eis, ut in memoriam ac recordationem sanctorum martyrum sese oblectarent et in letitiam effunderentur, quod successu temporis aliquando futurum esset, ut sua sponte ad honestiorem et accuratiorem vitae rationem transirent.—When *Gregory* perceived, that the ignorant and simple multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensitive pleasures and delights it afforded—he allowed them in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure, (i. e. as the thing itself, and both what precedes and what follows, place beyond all controversy, he allowed them at the

§ 3. *Secondly*, the simplicity of the worship which christians offered to the Deity, gave occasion to certain calumnies, maintained both by the Jews and the pagan priests. The christians were pronounced *Atheists*; because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp, in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the christian doctors thought they must introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of people; so that they could maintain, that they really *had* all those things of which christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms.

§ 4. *Thirdly*, it is well known, that in the books of the New Testament, various parts of the christian religion are expressed in terms borrowed from the Jewish laws, or are in some measure compared with the Mosaic rites. This mode of expressing their thoughts, the christian doctors and writers not only imitated, but extended still farther. In this there was little to censure. But in time, either from inconsideration, or from ignorance, or from motives of policy, the greater part maintained that such phraseology was not figurative, but accordant with the nature of the things, and to be understood in its proper sense. The bishops were at first, innocently called *high priests*, and the presbyters, *priests*, and the deacons, *Levites*. But in a little time, those to whom these titles were given abused them; and maintained that they had the same rank and dignity, and possessed the same rights and privileges with those who bore these titles under the Mosaic dispensation. Hence the origin of *first fruits*, and next of *tithes*; hence the *splendid garments*, and many other things. In like manner, the comparison of the christian *oblations* with the Jewish *victims* and *sacrifices*, produced many unnecessary rites; and in time, corrupted essentially the doctrine of the *Lord's supper*, which e'er they were aware of it was converted into a *sacrifice*.

§ 5. *Fourthly*, among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what were called the *Mysteries*. This circumstance led the christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say, that *they* also had similar *mysteries*, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to the

sepulchres of the martyrs on their feast days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all the things, that the worshippers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples, on their festival days,) hoping, that in process of time, they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life.

(4) Examples are given by *Is. Casaubon*, Exercit. xvi. in *Annales Baronii*, p. 388. *Ja. Tollius*, Insignibus itineris Italici, Notes p. 151, 163. *Ez. Spanheim*, Notes to his French translation of *Julian's Caesars*, p. 133, 134. *Dav. Clarkson*, Discourse on Liturgies, p. 36, 42, 43. and others.

christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's supper ; but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms.(4) This practice originated in the eastern provinces ; and thence, after the times of *Adrian*, (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins,)(5) it spread among the christians of the West. . A large part, therefore, of the christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries.

§ 6. *Fifthly*, many ceremonies took their rise from the custom of the Egyptians and of almost all the eastern nations, of conveying instruction by *images*, *actions*, and sensible *signs* and emblems. The christian doctors, therefore, thought it would be advantageous to the cause of christianity, to place the truths, which are necessary to be known in order to salvation, as it were, *before the eyes* of the unreflecting multitude, who with difficulty contemplate abstract truths. The new converts were to be taught, that those are *born again*, who are initiated by baptism into the christian worship, and that they ought to exhibit in their conduct the innocence of little infants : therefore *milk* and *honey*, the common food of infants, was administered to them. Those who obtained admission to the kingdom of *Christ*, from being the servants of the devil, became the Lord's freed men ; and, like newly enlisted soldiers, swore to obey their commander. And therefore certain rites were borrowed from military usages, and from the forms of manumission.(6)

§ 7. *Lastly*, not to be tedious ; whoever considers, that the christians were collected from among the Jews and from the pagan nations, who were accustomed, from their earliest years, to various ceremonies and superstitious rites ; and that the habits of early life are very hard to be laid aside ; will perceive, that it would have been little short of a miracle, if nothing corrupt and debasing had found its way into the christian church. For example ; nearly all the people of the East, before the christian era, were accustomed to worship with their faces directed towards the sun rising. For they all believed, that God, whom they sup-

(5) *Spartianus*, Hadrian, c. 13. p. 15. ed. Obrechtii. [*Spartian* speaks only of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, into which *Adrian* was initiated at Athens. These, it may be, that *Adrian* first introduced among the Latins ; yet he was not the first Roman initiated in them.—That *some Mysteries* had before this time, been introduced into the Roman worship, appears from the Epistles of *Cicero* to *Atticus*, L. v. 21. end ; Lib. vi. 1. end ; L. xv. 25. *Gronovius* indeed understands these (*mysteria Romana*) to be the worship of the goddess *Bona Dea*. See his *Observ.* L. iv. c. 9. But on this worship, no male person might attend ; and I see not why *Cicero* should enquire so particularly of his friend, (as he does,) about the time of these mysteries, if they were nothing but the worship of a deity, in which none but *females* ever bore any part. *Schl.*]

(6) See *Edm. Merill*, *Observations*, Lib. iii. cap. iii. [*C. G. Schwartz*, *Diss.* de ritibus quibusdam formulisque a manumissione ad S. Baptismum translatis, Altdorf. 1738. and *J. G. Zentgraf's* *Diss.* at Jena, under Dr. *Walch*, 1749, de Ritibus baptismalibus sæculi secundi. *Schl.*]

posed to resemble light, or rather to be light, and whom they limited as to place, had his residence in that part of the heavens where the sun rises. When they became christians they rejected indeed the erroneous belief; but the custom that originated from it, and which was very ancient and universally prevalent, they retained. Nor to this hour, has it been wholly laid aside. From the same cause many Jewish rites originated, which are still religiously maintained by many christians, and especially by those who live in eastern countries.(7)

§ 8. The rites themselves, I shall state only summarily; for this extensive subject deserves to be considered by itself, and can not be fully discussed in the narrow limits of our work. The christians assembled for the worship of God in *private dwelling houses*, in *caves*, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the *first day* of the week; and here and there, also on the *seventh day*, which was the Jewish sabbath. Most of them likewise held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Savior was betrayed, and the latter, that on which he was crucified. The *hours* of the day allotted to these meetings, varied according to times and circumstances; most of them could assemble only in the *evening*, or *before the dawn* of day in the morning. When the christians were assembled, *prayers* were recited; (the purport of which, *Tertullian* gives us;)(8) the holy *scriptures* were read;(9) short *discourses* on christian duties were addressed to the people; *hymns* were sung; and at last, the *Lord's supper* and the love-feasts were celebrated, the oblations of the people affording them the materials.(10)

(7) See *Jo. Spencer*, de Legibus ritualibus Ebraeor. Prolegom. p. 9. ed. Cantab. and all those who have explained the rites and usages of the oriental christians.

(8) *Tertullian*, Apologeticum, cap. 39.

(9) [That other religious books, besides the canonical scriptures, were read in several churches, appears from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. 23. and iii. 3. who informs us, that the first Epistle of *Clement*; and that of *Soter*, bishops of Rome, were publicly read in the church of Corinth; as was the *Shepherd of Hermas*, in very many churches. Tr.]

(10) [*Pliny* (Epistolar. L. x. Ep. 97.) gives some account of the public worship of the christians, in the beginning of this century: and *Justin Martyr*, near the close of that Apology which he presented to *Antoninus Pius*, AD. 150, gives the following more full and authentic account: "On the day which is called *Sunday*, all, whether dwelling in the towns or in the villages, hold meetings; and the *Memoires* (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read, as much as the time will permit; then, the reader closing, the President in a speech, exhorts and excites to an imitation of those excellent examples; then we all rise, and pour forth united prayers; and when we close our prayer, as was before said, bread is brought forward, and wine, and water; and the President utters prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, (ὅσην δύναμις ἔσται,) and the people respond, by saying *amen*; and a distribution and participation of the things blessed, takes place to each one present, and to those absent, it is sent by the Deacons. And those who are prosperous and willing, give what they choose, each according to his own pleasure; and what is collected, is deposited

§ 9. The christians of this century consecrated anniversary festivals, in memory of the Savior's death, and resurrection, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles. The day in remembrance of *Christ's* dying and expiating the sins of men, was called the *Passover*, or *Easter*, (*Pascha*,) because they supposed that *Christ* was crucified on the same day in which the Jews kept their *Passover*. But in observing this festival, the christians of Asia Minor differed from other christians, and especially from those of Rome. Both fasted during what was called the *great week*, that on which *Christ* died; and in remembrance of the last supper of our Savior, they held a sacred feast or ate the paschal lamb, just as the Jews did; which feast, as well as the time of *Christ's* death, they denominated the *Passover* or *Easter*. Now the Asiatic christians held their paschal feast on the fourteenth day, or full moon, of the first Jewish month, which was the very time on which the Jews ate their *Passover*; and on the third day after this supper, they kept the memorial of *Christ's* triumph over death, or of his resurrection. This custom, they said they had received from the apostles *John* and *Philip*; and they moreover supported it by the example of *Christ* himself, who celebrated his paschal feast, at the same time with the Jews. But the other christians put off their *Passover*, that is, their paschal feast, until the evening preceding the festal day, sacred to *Christ's* resurrection, [or Saturday evening,] and thus connected the memorial of *Christ's* death, with that of his resurrection. And they cited *Peter* and *Paul* as authors of their custom.

§ 10. The Asiatic custom of celebrating *Easter*, had two great inconveniences, which appeared intolerable to the other christians, and especially to the Romans. First, by holding their sacred feast on the very day, on which they supposed *Christ* ate the paschal lamb with his disciples, they interrupted the *fast* of the great week; which appeared to the other christians to fall little short of a crime. Again, as they always kept the memorial of *Christ's* rising from the dead, on the *third day* after their paschal supper, it unavoidably happened, that they more commonly kept, on some other day of the week than the first or Sunday, called the Lord's day, the festival of *Christ's* resurrection, which in after times was called and is now called the *Passover* or *Easter*.

with the President; and he carefully relieves the orphans and widows, and those who from sickness or other causes are needy, and also those in prison, and the strangers that are residing with us, and in short, all that have need of help. We all commonly hold our assemblies on *Sunday*, because it is the first day, on which God converted the darkness and matter, and framed the world; and *Jesus Christ* our Saviour, on the same day, arose from the dead."—*Justin* makes no mention here of *singing*, as a part of the public worship of christians. But *Pliny* in his Epistle, assures us; "Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire; *carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem*:" and both the N. Testament, and all antiquity, recognise singing, as a part of christian worship. Tr]

Now the greater part of the christians deemed it wrong to consecrate any other day than the Lord's day, in remembrance of *Christ's* resurrection. Hence great contention frequently arose from this difference between the Asiatic and the other christians. In the reign of *Antoninus Pius*, about the middle of this century, *Anicetus* bishop of Rome, and *Polycarp* bishop of Smyrna, investigated this subject with great care at Rome. But the Asiatics could not be induced by any considerations, to give up their custom, which they believed to be handed down to them from *St. John*.(11)

§ 11. Near the close of the century, *Victor* bishop of Rome, thought it necessary, that the Asiatic christians should be compelled, by laws and decrees, to follow the rule adopted by the greater part of the christian world. Accordingly, after ascertaining the opinions of foreign bishops, he sent an imperious letter to the Asiatic bishops, admonishing them to follow the example of other christians in observing Easter. They replied with spirit, by *Polycrates* bishop of Ephesus, that they would not depart from the holy institution of their ancestors. Irritated by this decision, *Victor* excluded them from his communion, and from that of his church, (not from that of the universal church, which he had not power to do,) that is, he pronounced them unworthy to be called his brethren. The progress of this schism was checked by *Irenaeus*, bishop of Lyons, in letters wisely composed, directed to *Victor* and others, and by the Asiatic bishops, who wrote a long letter in their own justification. And thus both parties retained their respective customs, until the council of Nice, in the fourth century, abrogated the Asiatic usage.(12)

§ 12. When the christians celebrated the Lord's supper, which they were accustomed to do chiefly on Sundays, they consecrated a part of the bread and wine of the oblations, by certain prayers, which the bishop of the congregation uttered. The wine was mixed with water; the bread was divided into small pieces. Portions of the consecrated bread and wine were commonly sent to the absent and the sick, in testimony of fraternal affection towards them.(13) There is much evidence that this

(11) *Eusebius*, Hist Eccles. Lib. iv. c. 14, and L. v. c. 24.

(12) What is here stated briefly, is more fully explained in my Comment. de Rebus Christianor. ante Constantinum M. p. 435 &c. I there said, p. 439, that *Peter Faydit* saw the mistake in the common accounts of this controversy. But my memory failed me. On consulting the book, I find, that he treats of the controversy indeed, but he misunderstood the precise subject of it.—The venerable *Heumann's* tract on this controversy, is republished in the *Sylloge* of his minor works.—[Dr. *Mosheim* thinks the true statement of this controversy is that which he has given; and that many writers have mistaken the points at issue, from not distinguishing between the ancient and the more modern application of the term *Passover* or *Easter*. Tr.]

(13) See *Henry Rizner*, de Ritibus veterum Christianor. circa Eucharistiam, p. 155, &c.

most holy rite was regarded as necessary to the attainment of salvation: and I therefore dare not accuse of error, those who believe that the sacred supper was, in this century, given to infants.(14) Of the *love-feasts*, the notice before given, may be sufficient.

§ 13. Twice a year, namely at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*,(15) (*Paschatis et Pentecostis diebus*,) *baptism* was publicly administered by the *bishop*, or by the *presbyters* acting by his command and authority. The candidates for it, were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Savior's precept, after they had repeated, what they called the *Creed*, (*Symbolum*,) and had renounced all their sins and transgressions, and especially the *devil* and his *pomp*. The baptised were signed with the cross, anointed, commended to God by prayer and imposition of hands, and finally directed to taste some milk and honey.(16) The reasons for these ceremonies, must be sought in what has already been said respecting the causes of the ceremonies. Adults were to prepare their minds expressly, by prayers, fasting, and other devotional exercises. *Sponsors* or *godfathers* were, as I apprehend, first employed for adults, and afterwards for children likewise.(17)

(14) See *Jo. Fr. Mayer*, Diss. de eucharistia infantum; and *Peter Zornius*, *Historia eucharistiae infantum*, Berol. 1736. 8vo.

(15) See *W. Wall*, *History of infant Baptism*, vol. I. p. 277, 279, of the Latin edition by *Schlosser*, *Jos. Vicecomes*, de Ritibus baptismi, Paris 1618. 8vo.

(16) See especially, *Tertullian* de Baptismo, [and respecting the honey and milk, *Tertullian* de Corona; and *Clemens Alex.* *Paedag.* L. I. c. 6. *Schl.*]

(17) See *Ger. van Mastricht*, de Susceptoribus infantum ex baptismo, edit. 2d. Frankf. 1727. 4to. He thinks *Sponsors* were used for children, and not for adults; p. 15. See also *W. Wall*, *Hist. of infant Baptism*, vol. I. p. 69, 474 &c.—[The manner of receiving new converts into the churches, about the year 150, is thus minutely described by *Justin Martyr*, in his (so called) second *Apology*, towards the conclusion. "In what manner we dedicate ourselves to God, after being renewed by *Christ*, we will now explain; lest by omitting this, we should seem to dissemble in our statement. 'Those who believe and are persuaded, that the things we teach and inculcate are true, and who profess ability thus to live, are directed to pray, with fasting, and to ask of God the forgiveness of their former sins; we also fasting and praying with them. Then we conduct them to a place where there is water; and they are regenerated [baptized], in the manner in which we have been regenerated [baptized]; for they receive a washing with water, in the name of the Father of all, the Lord God, and of our Savior, *Jesus Christ*, and of the Holy Spirit. For *Christ* said; *Except ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*'—'This washing is likewise called *illumination*; because the minds of those who have learned these things, are enlightened. And whoever is enlightened, is washed in the name of *Jesus Christ*, who was crucified under *Pontius Pilate*; and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who by the prophets, foretold all that relates to *Christ.*'—'And after thus washing the convinced and consenting person, we conduct him to where the brethren, as we call them, are assembled; and there offer our united supplications, with earnestness, both for ourselves and for the enlightened person, and for all others every where; that we may conduct ourselves as becomes those who have received the truth, and by our deeds prove ourselves good citizens, and observers of what is commanded us; so that we may be saved with an eternal salvation. And on ending our prayers, we salute each other with a kiss. Then, there is placed before the President of the brethren, bread, and a cup of water

and wine; which he taking, offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at great length, that such blessings are vouchsafed us; and when he ends the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present respond, *amen*. Now the word *amen*, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies *so be it*. And after the President has given thanks, and all the people have uttered the response, those whom we call Deacons, distribute to every one present, to partake of the bread and the wine and water, over which thanks were given: and to those not present, the Deacons carry it. And this food is called by us the *Eucharist*; which it is unlawful for any one to partake of, unless he believes the things taught by us to be true, and has been washed with the washing for the remission of sins in regeneration, and lives according to what *Christ* has taught." *Tr.*]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Discord among the Jewish christians.—§ 2. Hence the Nazareans and Ebionites.—§ 3. Their impiety.—§ 4. The sects originating from the oriental philosophy.—§ 5. Elxai and Elcesaites.—§ 6. Saturninus; his extravagancies.—§ 7. Cerdo and Marcion.—§ 8. Bardesanes.—§ 9. Tatian and the Encratites.—§ 10. Peculiar sentiments of the Egyptian Gnostics.—§ 11. Basilides.—§ 12. His enormities.—§ 13. His moral principles.—§ 14. Carpocrates.—§ 15. Valentinus.—§ 16. His extravagancies.—§ 17. Various sects of Valentinians.—§ 18. The minor sects of Valentinians.—§ 19. The Ophites.—§ 20. Monarchians and Patropasians.—§ 21. Theodotus, Artemon.—§ 22. Hermogenes.—§ 23. The illiterate sects. Montanus.—§ 24. The success of Montanus, and his doctrine.

§ 1. Among the christian sects that arose in this century, the first place is due to those Jewish christians, whose zeal for the Mosaic law, severed them from the other believers in *Christ*.⁽¹⁾ The rise of this sect took place in the reign of *Adrian*. For, when this emperor had wholly destroyed Jerusalem a second time, and enacted severe laws against the Jews, the greater part of the christians living in Palestine, that they might not be confounded with Jews, as they had been, laid aside the Mosaic ceremonies, and chose one *Mark*, who was a foreigner and not a Jew, for their bishop. This procedure was very offensive to those among them, whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was too strong to be eradicated. They therefore separated from their brethren, and formed a distinct society in *Peraea*, a part of *Palestine*, and in the neighboring regions; and among them, the Mosaic law retained all its dignity unimpaired.⁽²⁾

§ 2. This body of people, who would unite *Moses* and *Christ*, was again divided into two classes, differing widely in their opinions and customs, the *Nazareans* and the *Ebionites*. The former are not reckoned, by the ancient christians, among heretics;⁽³⁾ but the latter are placed among those sects which sub-

(1) [The origin, names, and diversity of opinion, of this class of sects, are well stated by *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 603—626. Tr.]

(2) See *Sulpitius Severus*, *Historia sacra*, L. ii. c. 31. p. 245 &c. [p. 381. ed. *Hornii*, 1647. He says: "Adrian stationed a regiment of soldiers as a constant guard, to prevent all Jews from entering Jerusalem; which was advantageous to the christian faith; because, at that time, nearly all [the Jewish christians] believed in *Christ* as God, yet with an observance of the law." Tr.]

(3) The first that ranked the Nazareans among the heretics, was *Epiphanius*, a writer of the 4th century, of no great fidelity, or accuracy of judgment. [*A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 619, 620. thinks the *Nazareans*, described by *Epiphanius*, were descendants of the *Ebionites*, who had now im-

verted the foundations of religion. Both sects used a history of *Christ* or a *Gospel*, which was different from our *Gospels*.(4) The word *Nazarean* was not the name of a *sect*, but was equivalent to the word *christian*. For those who bore the title of *christians* among the Greeks, were among the Jews called *Nazareans*, and did not esteem it a name of disgrace. Those who retained, after their separation from their brethren, this original name for the disciples of *Christ* which was imposed on them by the Jews, believed *Christ* to be born of a virgin, and to be in some way united with the divine nature. And although they would not discard the ceremonies prescribed by *Moses*, yet they would not obtrude them upon the Gentile christians. They moreover rejected the additions made to the Mosaic ritual, by the doctors of the law and the Pharisees.(5) It is therefore easy to see, why the other christians in general judged more favorably of them.

§ 3. Whether the *Ebionites* derived their name from a man [called *Ebion*,] or were so denominated on account of their *poverty* either in regard to property or sentiment, is uncertain.(6) But they were much worse than the Nazareans. For though they supposed *Christ* to be an ambassador of God, and endowed with divine power, yet they conceived him to be a man, born in the ordinary course of nature, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*. They maintained that the ceremonial law of *Moses* must be observed, not by the Jews only, but by all who wished to obtain salvation; and therefore, *St. Paul*, that strenuous opposer of the law, they viewed with abhorrence. Nor were they satisfied with the mere rites which *Moses* appointed, but observed with equal veneration, the superstitious rites of their ancestors, and the customs of the Pharisees which were added to the law.(7)

bibed some Gnostic principles. The names *Ebionites* and *Nazareans* are often confounded, both by ancients and moderns. *Tr.*]

(4) See *J. A. Fabricius*, *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* tom. i. p. 355 &c. and *Mosheim*, *Vindiciæ, contra Tolandi Nazarenum*, p. 112 &c. [*Jones*, on the Canon of the N. Test. vol. i. and the authors of *Introductions to the N. Test.* *Tr.*]

(5) See *Mich. le Quien*, *Adnotatt. ad Damascenum*, tom. i. p. 82, 83. and his *Diss. de Nazarenis et eorum fide*; which is the 7th of his *Dissertations* subjoined to his edition of the *Works of Damascenus*. [*C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzeren*, Vol. i. p. 101 &c. *Schl.*]

(6) See *Fabricius*, *ad Philastr. de hæresibus*, p. 81. *Thom. Ittig*, *de hæresibus ævi Apostolici*. [also Note (22) on Cent. i. Pt. ii. ch. v. p. 118. and *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 612 &c. *Tr.*]

(7) *Irenæus*, *contra Hæreses*, Lib. i. cap. 26. *Epiphanius* treats largely of the *Ebionites*, in his *Panarium*, hæres. xxx. But he is worthy of no credit; for he acknowledges, (§ 3. p. 127. and § 14. p. 141,) that he has joined the *Sampsaeans* and the *Elcesaites* with the *Ebionites*, and that the first *Ebionites* did not hold the errors which he attributes to the sect.—[The correctness of *Epiphanius*, as a historian, is often called in question; and perhaps justly. But if the term *Ebionites* designated a variety of minor sects, all of them Jewish christians; and if some of these sects had, in the 4th century, imbibed Gnostic sentiments, unknown to the original *Ebionites*; then *Epiphanius* may here be entirely correct; which others suppose to be the fact. See *Neander*, as cited abov. Note (3) *Tr.*]

§ 4. These little and obscure sects were not very detrimental to the christian cause. Much greater disturbance was produced by those, whose founders explained the doctrines of christianity agreeably to the precepts of the oriental philosophy respecting the origin of evil. These latter sects, having lived in obscurity and made little noise previously to this century, came forth into public view during the reign of *Adrian*, (8) and gathered churches of considerable magnitude in various countries. A long catalogue of these semi-christian sects, might be gathered out of the writings of the ancients : but of the greater part of them, we know no more than their names ; and perhaps many of them differed only in name from each other. Those which acquired notoriety beyond others, may be divided into two classes. The first class originated in Asia, and maintained the philosophy of the East in regard to the origin of the universe, (if I may so say,) pure and uncorrupt : the other class, which were set up among the Egyptians, and by Egyptians, mingled with that philosophy many monstrous opinions and principles of the Egyptians. The systems of the former were more simple and intelligible ; those of the latter were much more complicated, and more difficult of explication.

§ 5. The first place, in the Asiatic class, seems to belong to *Elxai*, a Jew, who is said to have founded the sect of the *Elcesaites*, in the reign of *Trajan*. Though he was a Jew, and worshipped one God, and revered *Moses* ; yet he corrupted the religion of his fathers, by many false notions derived from the philosophy and superstition of the orientals ; and, after the example of the *Essenes*, expounded the Mosaic law according to the dictates of reason, or in other words, made it an allegory. But *Epiphanius*, who had read one of *Elxai's* books, acknowledges himself in doubt, whether the *Elcesaites* should be reckoned among the christian sects, or among the Jewish. In his book *Elxai* mentions *Christ*, and speaks honorably of him ; but he does not explain himself so as to make it manifest, whether *Jesus of Nazareth* was the Christ of whom he speaks. (9)

§ 6. If *Elxai* be not reckoned, *Saturninus* of Antioch will justly stand at the head of this class ; at least he lived earlier than all the other *Gnostic* heresiarchs, [having taught his doctrine in the reign of *Adrian*. *Tr.*] He supposed *two first causes* of all things, the *good God*, and *matter*, which is in its nature evil, and subject to a Lord. The world and the first men were created by

(8) *Clemens Alex.* Stromat. L. vii. c. 17. p. 898. *Cyprian*, Epist. lxxv. p. 144. and others.

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vi. c. 38. *Epiphanius*, Haeres. xix. § 3. p. 41. *Theodoret.* Fabul. haeret. Lib. ii. c. 7. p. 221. [Of these *Elcesaites*, who were also called *Sampsaeans*, every thing afforded by antiquity, that is important, has been collected by *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 567. &c. He justly accounts them enthusiasts. *Schl.*]

seven angels, that is, by all the rulers of the seven planets, without the knowledge of God, and against the will of the Lord of matter. But God approved of the work when it was completed, imparted rational souls to the men, who before had only animal life, and divided the entire world into seven parts, which he subjected to the seven creators, of whom the God of the Jews was one, reserving however the supreme power to himself. To these good men, that is, men possessed of wise and good souls, the Lord of matter opposed another sort of men, to whom he imparted a malignant soul. And hence the difference between good and bad men which is so visible. After the creators of the world had revolted from the supreme God, he sent down *Christ* from heaven, clothed, not with a real body, but with the shadow of one, that in our world, he might destroy the kingdom of the Lord of matter, and point out to the good souls the way of returning back to God. But this way is a hard and difficult one. For the souls that would ascend to God, after the dissolution of the body, must abstain from flesh, wine, marriage, and from all things which either exhilarate the body or delight the senses.—*Saturninus* taught in Syria, which was his native country, and especially at Antioch; and he drew many after him, by his great show of virtue.(10)

§ 7. In the same class of Asiatic Gnostics, must be placed *Cerdo*, a Syrian, and *Marcion*, the son of a bishop of Pontus. The history of these men is obscure and uncertain. It appears, however, that they began to establish their sect at Rome; that *Cerdo* taught his principles there, before the arrival of *Marcion*; that *Marcion*, failing to obtain some office in the church at Rome, in consequence of some misconduct, went over to the party of *Cerdo*, and with great success propagated their tenets over the world. In the manner of the orientals, *Marcion* taught that there are *two first causes* of all things, the one perfectly *good*, the other perfectly *evil*. Intermediate between these two Deities, ranks the Architect of this lower world, whom men worship, and who was the God and the Lawgiver of the Jews; for he is neither perfectly good, nor perfectly evil, but of a mixed nature, or, as *Marcion* expressed it, he is *just*; and therefore he can dispense punishments, as well as rewards. The evil Deity and the Creator of the world are perpetually at war. Each wishes to be worshipped as God, and to subject the inhabitants of the whole world to himself. The Jews are the subjects of the Creator of the world, who is a very powerful spirit or demon; the other nations, which

(10) *Irenaeus*, L. i. c. 24. *Euseb.* Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 7. *Epiphan.* Haeres. xxiii. *Theodoret.* Fabul. haeret. L. i. c. 2. and the other writers on the heresies. [Among the modern writers, see *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 336, &c. *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 274. &c. *Ittig*, de Haeresiarch. saecul. ii. c. 1. *Tillemont*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tom. ii. p. 215. and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 759. &c. Tr.]

worship many gods, are subjects of the evil Deity. Each is an oppressor of rational souls, and holds them in bondage. In order therefore, to put an end to this war, and give freedom to the souls which are of divine origin; the supreme God sent among the Jews, *Jesus Christ*, who is of a nature very similar to himself, or his Son, clothed with the appearance or shadow of a body, which would render him visible; with commission, to destroy both the kingdom of the world's Creator, and that of the evil Deity, and to invite souls back to God. He was assailed both by the prince of darkness [the evil Deity,] and by the God of the Jews, or the world's Creator; but they were unable to hurt him, because he had only the appearance of a body. Whoever, according to *his* prescriptions, will abstract their minds from all sensible objects, and renouncing as well the laws of the God of the Jews as those of the prince of darkness, will turn wholly to the supreme God, and at the same time subdue and mortify their bodies by fasting and other means, shall, after death, ascend to the celestial mansions. The moral discipline which *Marcion* prescribed to his followers, was, as the nature of the system required, very austere and rigorous. For he condemned marriages, wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasant to the body.—*Marcion* had numerous followers; among whom *Lucan* or *Lucian*, *Severus*, *Blastes* and others, but especially *Apelles*, are said to have deviated in some respects from the opinions of their master, and to have established new sects.(11)

§ 8. *Bardesanes* and *Tatian* are commonly supposed to have been of the school of *Valentinus* the Egyptian, but erroneously; for their systems differ, in many respects, from that of the *Valentineans*, and come nearer to the oriental principle of two first causes of all things. *Bardesanes* was a Syrian of Edessa, a man of great acumen, and distinguished for his many learned productions. Seduced by his attachment to the oriental philosophy, he placed in opposition to the supreme God, who is absolute goodness, a prince of darkness, who is the author of all evil. The supreme God created the world, free from all evil; and formed men, who possessed celestial souls, and subtile, etherial bodies. After the prince of darkness had induced the first men to sin, God permitted the author of all evil to inclose men in gross bodies formed out of sinful matter, and also, to corrupt the world in order that men might suffer for the iniquity they had committed. Hence

(11) Besides the common writers on the heresies, as *Irenaeus*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret* &c. see *Tertullian's* five Books against *Marcion*; and the Poem against *Marcion*, also in five Books, which is ascribed to *Tertullian*; and the Dialogue against the *Marcionites*, which is ascribed to *Origen*. Among the modern writers, see *Massuet*, the editor of *Irenaeus*; *Tillemont*; *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, tom. ii p. 69 &c. [*C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. i. p. 484—537. *Mosheim* de *Reb. Christ* &c. p. 401—410. *A. Neander*, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. P ii. p. 779—807. Tr.]

the struggle between reason and concupiscence in man. *Jesus* therefore descended from the celestial regions, clothed, not with a real, but with a celestial and etherial body, and taught men to subdue their depraved bodies, and to free themselves from the bondage of vicious matter, by abstinence, by meditation, and by fasting; and whoever will do so, on the dissolution of the body, shall ascend to the mansions of the blessed, clothed in their etherial vehicles, or their celestial bodies. *Bardesanes* afterwards returned to sounder sentiments; but his sect long survived in Syria.(12)

§ 9. *Tatian*, by birth an Assyrian, a distinguished and learned man, and disciple of *Justin Martyr*, was more noted among the ancients for his austere moral principles which were rigid beyond measure, than for the speculative errors or dogmas which he proposed as articles of faith to his followers. Yet it appears from credible witnesses, that he held *matter* to be the source of all evil, and therefore recommended the abhorrence and the mortification of the body; that he supposed the Creator of the world and the true God were not one and the same being; that he denied to our Savior a real body; and corrupted christianity with other doctrines of the oriental philosophers. His followers who were numerous, were sometimes called from him, *Tatiani* or *Tatianists*; but more frequently were designated by names indicative of their austere morals. For, as they discarded all the external comforts and conveniences of life, and held wine in such abhorrence as to use mere water in the Lord's supper, fasted rigorously, and lived in celibacy; they were denominated *Encratitae* or *abstainers*, *Hydroparastatae* or *Water-drinkers*, and *Apotactitae* or *Renouncers*.(13)

§ 10. The Gnostics of the Egyptian class, differed from those of the Asiatic, by combining the oriental with Egyptian philosophy, and more especially in the following particulars. (I.) Although they supposed matter to be eternal, and also animated; yet they did not recognize an eternal prince of darkness and of matter, or the malignant deity of the Persians. (II.) They gene-

(12) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 30. and the writers on the ancient heresies. *Origen*, Dial. contra Marcionitas § 3. p. 70. ed. Wetstein. *Fred. Strunzius*, Historia Bardesanis et Bardesanistar. Wittemb. 1722. 4to. *Beausobre*, Hist. du Manicheisme, vol. ii. p. 128. &c. [*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 394. &c. *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 407—424. *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 743 &c. Tr.]

(13) The only work of *Tatian* that has reached us, is his Oratio ad Graecos. His opinions are spoken of by *Clemens Alex.* Strom. L. iii. p. 460. *Epiphanius*, Haeres. xlv. c. 1. p. 391. *Origen*, de Oratione, c. 13. p. 77. ed. Oxon. and by others of the ancients: but no one of them has attempted to delineate his system. [Of the moderns, see *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. I. p. 445—447. and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 762—766.—It should be remembered, that the names *Encratites*, *Apotactites*, (Εὔκρατοι Ἀποτακται,) were applied to all the austere sects; so that, though all *Tatianists* were *Encratites*, yet all *Encratites* were not *Tatianists*. Tr.]

rally considered *Christ* our Savior, as consisting of *two persons*, the man *Jesus*, and the Son of God, or *Christ* : and the latter, the divine person, they supposed, entered into *Jesus* the man, when he was baptized in Jordan by *Iohn* ; and parted from him, when he was made a prisoner by the Jews. (III.) They attributed to *Christ* a real, and not an imaginary body ; though they were not all of one sentiment on this point. (IV.) They prescribed to their followers a much milder system of moral discipline ; nay, seemed to give precepts which favored the corrupt propensities of men.

§ 11. Among the Egyptian Gnostics, the first place is commonly assigned to *Basilides* of Alexandria. He maintained, that the supreme and all perfect God produced from himself, seven most excellent beings or *Aeons*. Two of the *Aeons*, namely *Dynamis* and *Sophia*, (*Power* and *Wisdom*,) procreated the angels of the highest order. Those angels built for themselves a residence or heaven, and produced other angels of a nature a little inferior. Other generations of angels succeeded, and other heavens were built, until there were three hundred and sixty five heavens, and as many orders of angels ; that is, just as many as there are days in a year. Over all these heavens and angelic orders, there is a Prince or Lord, whom *Basilides* called *Abraxas* ; a word which was doubtless in use among the Egyptians, before *Basilides*, and which, when written in Greek, contains letters that together make up the number 365, i. e. the number of the heavens.(14) The inhabitants of the lowest heaven, contiguous to eternal matter, which is an animated and malignant substance, formed a design of constructing a world out of that disorderly mass, and of fabricating men. God approved the work when it

(14) A great number of gems still exist, and quantities of them are daily brought to us from Egypt, on which, besides other figures of Egyptian device, the word *Abraxas* is engraved. See *Jo. Macarius*, *Abraxas seu de gemmis Basilidianis disquisitio* ; enlarged by *Jo. Chifflet*, ed. Antwerp 1657. 4to. *Bern. de Montfaucon*, *Palaeograph. Graecae*, L. ii. c. 8. p. 177, &c. and others. Learned men almost universally think those gems originated from *Basilides* ; and hence they are called *gemmae Basilidianae*. But very many of them exhibit marks of the most degrading superstition, such as cannot be attributed even to a semi-christian ; and likewise manifest insignia of the Egyptian religion. They cannot *all*, therefore, be attributed to *Basilides*, who, though he held many errors, yet worshipped *Christ*. Those only must refer to him, which bear some marks of christianity. The word *Abraxas*, was unquestionably used by the ancient Egyptians, and appropriated to the Lord of the heavens ; which *Basilides* retained from the philosophy and religion of his country. See *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manicheisme*, vol. ii. p. 51. *Jo. Bapt. Passeri*, *Diss. de Gemmis Basilidianis* ; in his splendid work, *de Gemmis stelliferis*, tom. ii. p. 221 &c. ed. Florent. 1750. Fol. *P. E. Jablonski*, *de Nominis Abraxas significatione* ; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens. nova*, tom. vii. *Passeri* contends that *none* of these gems have reference to *Basilides* : he makes them all refer to the magicians, or the soothsayers, sorcerers, conjurers and fortune-tellers. But this learned man, it appears to me, goes too far ; for he himself acknowledges, (p. 225,) that *he sometimes found on them some vestiges of the Basilidian errors*. These celebrated gems still need an erudite, but cautious and judicious interpreter.

was finished ; and gave rational souls to these men whom the angels had formed ; whereas, before they had only sensitive souls : he also gave to the angels, dominion over men. The Prince of these angels chose the Jewish nation for *his* subjects, and gave them a law by *Moses*. The other angels presided over other nations.

§ 12. The angels who created and governed the world, gradually became corrupt ; and they not only labored to obliterate the knowledge of the supreme God, in order that they might themselves be worshipped as Gods, but they waged war with each other, for the enlargement of their respective territories. The most arrogant and restless of them all, was he who governed the Jewish nation. Therefore the supreme God in compassion to the souls endowed with reason, sent down from heaven his *Son*, or, the prince of the *Aeons*, whose name is *Nus*, [*νοῦς*, *mind*,] and *Christ* ; that he, joining himself to the man *Jesus*, might restore the lost knowledge of his Father, and overturn the empire of the angels who governed the world, and especially of the insolent Lord of the Jews. The God of the Jews perceiving this, ordered his subjects to seize the man *Jesus*, and put him to death : but against *Christ*, he had no power.(15) The souls that obey the precepts of the *Son* of God, when their bodies die, will ascend to God : the rest will ~~be sent~~ to other bodies. All bodies return back to vicious matter, whence they originated.

§ 13. The moral system of *Basilides*, if we believe most of the ancients, favored concupiscence, and allowed every species of iniquity. But from much surer testimony it appears, that he recommended purity of life and the practice of piety, and condemned even an inclination to sin. Still there were some things in his moral precepts which greatly offended other christians. For he taught, that it is lawful to conceal our religion, to deny *Christ* when our life is in danger, to participate in the pagan feasts which followed their sacrifices ; and he detracted much from the estimation and honor in which the martyrs were held, and maintained that they were greater sinners than other men, and were visited by divine justice for their iniquities. For it was a principle with him, that none but sinners suffer any evil in this life. And hence arose the suspicions entertained respecting his system of morals, which seemed to be confirmed by the flagitious lives of some of his disciples.(16)

(15) Many of the ancients tell us, on the authority of *Irenaeus*, that our Savior, according to *Basilides*' opinion, had not a real body ; and that *Simon* the Cyrenian was crucified in place of him. But that *Basilides* supposed the man *Jesus* and *Christ*, united, to constitute the Savior, is demonstrated in the *Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c.* p. 354 &c. It may be, that here and there a follower of *Basilides* held otherwise.

(16) Besides the ancient writers on the heresies, *Basilides* is particularly treated of, by *Ben. Massuet*, *Dissert. in Irenaeum* ; and *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du*

§ 14. But much viler than he, and the worst of all the Gnostics was *Corpocrates*, also of Alexandria, [who lived in the reign of *Adrian*.] His philosophy did not differ in its general principles, from that of the other Egyptian Gnostics. For he held to one supreme God, *Aeons* the offspring of God, eternal and malignant matter, the creation of the world from evil matter by angels, divine souls unfortunately inclosed in bodies, and the like. But he maintained that *Jesus* was born of *Joseph* and *Mary* in the ordinary course of nature, and that he was superior to other men in nothing but fortitude and greatness of soul. He also not only gave his disciples license to sin, but imposed on them a necessity of sinning; by teaching that the way to eternal salvation was open to those souls only, which committed all kinds of enormity and wickedness.—But it exceeds all credibility, that any man who believes there is a God, that *Christ* is the Savior of mankind, and who inculcates any sort of religion, should hold such sentiments. Besides, there are grounds to believe, that *Carpocrates*, like the other Gnostics, held the Savior to be composed of the man *Jesus*, and a certain Aeon called *Christ*; and that he imposed some laws of conduct on his disciples. Yet undoubtedly, there was something in his opinions and precepts, that rendered his piety very suspicious. For he held that concupiscence was implanted in the soul by the Deity, and is therefore perfectly innocent; that all actions are in themselves indifferent, and become good or evil only according to the opinions and laws of men; that in the purpose of God, all things are common property, even the women, but that such as use their rights, are by human laws accounted thieves and adulterers. Now if he did not add some corrective to the enormity of these principles, it must be acknowledged, that he wholly swept away the foundations of all virtue, and gave full license to all iniquity. (17)

§ 15. *Valentinus*, also an Egyptian, exceeded all his fellow heresiarchs, both in fame and in the multitude of his followers. His sect had its birth at Rome, grew to maturity in the island of

Manicheisme, vol. ii. p. 8. &c. [C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzerereyen*, vol. i. p. 281—309; Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 342—361; and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 679—704. Tr.]

(17) See *Irenaeus*, *contra Haeres.* L. i. c. 25. *Clement Alex.* *Stromat.* L. iii. p. 511, and the others. [Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 361—371. C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzer.* vol. i. p. 309—327. A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 767—773.—*Carpocrates* left a young son, *Epiphanes*, to propagate his system; and this son, though he died at the age of 17, wrote a book, from which the world have had to learn, what they could, of the tenets of *Carpocrates*. It is doubtful, whether he ought to be called a christian. He was an Egyptian philosopher, who had perhaps borrowed some notions from the christians, but still his philosophy was his cynosure. Two inscriptions, in the true spirit of this philosopher, recently discovered in Cyrene in Africa, have given rise to a conjecture, that his sect continued till the sixth century. See the inscriptions, with comments, in the Christmas Programm of Dr. W. Gesenius, AD. 1825. Tr.]

Cyprus, and with wonderful celerity traversed Asia, Africa, and Europe. *Valentinus* held the general principles common with his brother Gnostics, and he assumed the title of a *Gnostic*; yet he held several principles peculiar to himself. In the *Pleroma*, (which is the Gnostic name for the habitation of God,) he supposed thirty Aeons, fifteen males and as many females. Besides these, there were four unmarried; namely *Horus*, [ὅρος] the guardian of the confines of the Pleroma, *Christ*, the *Holy Spirit*, and *Jesus*. The youngest of the Aeons, *Sophia* (*Wisdom*), fired with vast desire of comprehending the nature of the supreme Deity, in her agitation, brought forth a daughter, called *Achamoth* [חכמות *the sciences, or philosophy*]; who being excluded from the Pleroma, descended to the rude and shapeless mass of matter, reduced it to some degree of order, and by the aid of *Jesus* brought forth *Demiurgus* [δημιουργός *Artificer*], the builder and Lord of all things. This *Demiurgus* separated the more subtile or *animal* matter, from the grosser, or *material*; and out of the former he framed the world above us, or the visible heavens; out of the latter, the lower world, or this earth. Men he compounded of both kinds of matter; and his mother, *Achamoth*, added to them a third substance which was celestial and spiritual. This is a brief outline of the complicated and tedious fable of *Valentinus*. It appears, that he explained the origin of the world, and of the human race, in a more subtile manner than the other Gnostics; yet, that he did not differ from them in reality. And the same is true of the other parts of his system.

§ 16. The Architect of the world, gradually became so inflated, that he either thought himself, or at least wished men to think him, to be the only God; and by his prophets, sent among the Jews, he arrogated to himself the honors of the supreme God. And the other angels, who presided over parts of the created universe, imitated his example. To repress this insolence of *Demiurgus*, and imbue souls with a knowledge of the true God, *Christ* descended, being composed of an animal and spiritual substance, and moreover clothed with an ethereal body. He passed through the body of *Mary*, just as water through a canal; and to him *Jesus*, one of the highest Aeons, joined himself, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*. The Architect of the world, who perceived that his dominion would be shaken by this divine man, caused him to be seized and crucified. But before *Christ* came to execution, not only *Jesus* the Son of God, but also the rational soul of *Christ*, forsook him; so that only his sentient soul and his ethereal body, were suspended on the cross.—Those who, according to the precepts of *Christ*, renounce the worship not only of the pagan deities, but likewise of the Jewish God, and submit to have their sentient and concupiscent soul chastised and reformed by reason, shall with both their souls, the rational and the

sentient, be admitted to the mansions of the blessed, near to the Pleroma. And when all particles of the divine nature, or all souls, shall be separated from matter and purified, then a raging fire shall spread through this material universe, and destroy the whole fabric of nature. For the whole oriental philosophy and the system of the Gnostics, may be reduced to this epitome: This world is composed of both good and evil. Whatever of good there is in it, was derived from the supreme God, the parent of light, and will return to him again; and when this takes place, this world will be destroyed.(18)

§ 17. The ancients represent the school of *Valentinus* as divided into many branches. Among these were; the *Ptolomaitic* sect, whose author *Ptolomy* differed from his master respecting the number and nature of the Aeon; the *Secundian* sect, established by *Secundus*, one of the principal followers of *Valentinus*, who seems to have kept more closely to the oriental philosophy, and to have held to *two first causes* of all things, *light* and *darkness*, or a Prince of good, and a Prince of evil; the sect of *Heracleon*, from whose books *Clement* and *Origen* quote much; the sect of *Marcus* and *Calarbasus*, called *Marcosians*, who, according to *Irenaeus*, added much that was senseless and absurd, to the fictions of *Valentinus*; though it is certain, that they did not maintain all that is attributed to them. I pass by other sects, which appear to have originated from the Valentinian system. But whether all the sects which are called Valentinian, actually originated from disciples and followers of *Valentinus*, appears very doubtful, to such as consider how great mistakes the ancients have made, in stating the origin of the heretics.(19)

(18) Of the Valentinian system, we have a full account in *Irenaeus*, contra Haeres. Lib. i. c. 1—7. *Tertullian*, Liber contra Valentinianos; *Clemens Alex.* passim; and in all the ancient writers on the heresies. Among the moderns, see *Jo. Fr. Buddeus*, Diss. de Haeresi Valentiniana; subjoined to his Introductio in Historiam philosoph. Ebraeorum: which Diss. has occasioned much discussion respecting the origin of this heresy. Some of the moderns have attempted to give a rational explanation of the intricate and absurd system of *Valentinus*. See *Souverain*, Platonisme dévoilé, cap. viii. p. 64. *Camp. Vitranga*, Observatt. Sacrae, Lib. i. c. ii. p. 131. *Beausobre*, Histoire du Manicheisme, p. 548 &c. *Ja. Basnage*, Hist. des Juifs, tome iii. p. 729, &c. *Peter Faydit*, Eclairciss. sur l'Hist. Eccles. des ii. premiers siècles. p. 12. who also contemplated writing an Apology for *Valentinus*. I pass by *Godfry Arnold*, the patron of all the heretics. But how vain all such attempts must be, is proved by this, that *Valentinus* himself professed that his religion differed fundamentally from that of the other christians. [Besides the authors above referred to, see *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 371—389; *C. W. F. Walch*, Hist. der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 335—386; and *Aug. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 704—731. Tr.]

(19) Besides *Irenaeus*, and the other ancient writers; see, concerning these sects, *Jo. Ern. Grabe*, Spicilegium Patrum et haereticorum, Saecul. ii. p. 69, 82, &c. On the Marcosians, *Irenaeus* is copious, Lib. i. cap. 14. That *Marcus* was out of his senses, is unquestionable; for he must have been deranged, if he could hold even the greater part of the strange fancies, which are said to belong to his system. [Among the moderns who have treated of these sects, see *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 387—401. and *A. Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 731—746. Tr.]

§ 18. Of the smaller and more obscure *Gnostic* sects, of which the ancients tell us little more than the names, and perhaps one or two detached sentiments, it is unnecessary to say any thing. Such were the *Adamites*, who are said to have wished to imitate the state of innocence:(20) the *Cainites*, who are represented as paying respect to the memory of *Cain*, *Corah*, *Dathan*, the inhabitants of *Sodom*, and *Judas* the traitor:(21) the *Abelites*, whom the ancients represent as marrying wives, but raising up no children:(22) the *Sethites*, who regarded *Seth* as the *Messiah*:(23) the *Florinians*, who originated at Rome, under *Florinus* and *Blastus*;(24) and many others. Perhaps the ancient christian doctors divided one sect into several, deceived by the fact of its having several names; they may also have had incorrect information respecting some of them.

§ 19. Among the Gnostics of the Egyptian class, a place must be assigned to the *Ophites* or *Serpentians*, a senseless sect, of

(20) [See, for an account of them; *Clemens Alex.* Stromat. Lib. i. p. 357, Lib. iii. p. 525, Lib. vii. p. 854: *Tertullian*, Scorpiacum, in Opp. p. 633, and contra Prax. cap. 3: *Epiphanius*, haeres. lii. Opp. tom. i. p. 459: *Theodoret*, haeret. Fabul. Lib. i. c. 6: *Augustine*, de Haeres. c. 31: *John Damascen*, Opp. tom. i. p. 88: and among the moderns, *C. W. F. Walch*, Hist. der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 327—335. *P. Bayle*, Dictionaire historique, Art. Adamites and Prodicus: *Tillemont*, Memoires &c. tom. ii. p. 256: *Beausobre*, Diss. sur les Adamites; subjoined to *Lenfant's* Histoire des Hussites.—The accounts of the ancients are contradictory; and several of the moderns doubt, whether there ever was a sect who performed their worship in a state of nudity. Tr.]

(21) [All the ancient writers, mentioned in the preceding note, except *John Damascen*, speak of the *Cainites*; but what they state is very brief, and contradictory. The correctness of their accounts, is justly doubted by *Bayle*, (Dictionaire Historique, Art. Cainites,) and others. *Origen*, (contra Celsum, Lib. iii. p. 119,) did not regard them as christians. Yet they might be a sect of Gnostics, who holding the God of the Jews for a revolter from the true God, regarded *Cain*, *Dathan*, *Corah*, and others who resisted him, as being very praiseworthy. Tr.]

(22) [The *Abelites* are mentioned only by *Augustine*, de Haeres. cap. 87; and by the author of the book, Praedestinatus, cap. 87. It is represented, that every man married a female child, and every woman a little boy, with whom they lived, and whom they made their heirs; hoping in this way to fulfil, literally, what *Paul* says, 1 Cor. vii. 29. that "They that have wives, be as though they had none."—The sect, is treated of, by *C. W. F. Walch*, Hist. der Ketz. vol. i. p. 607; who doubts whether it were not altogether an imaginary sect. Tr.]

(23) [The *Sethites* are mentioned by the author of Praedestinatus, cap. 19. and *Philastrius*, de Haeresib. cap. 3. But *Rhenferd*, (Diss. de Sethianis, in his Opp. philolog. p. 165;) and *Zorn*, [Opuscul. sacra, tom. i. p. 614,) consider this to be an imaginary sect. See *C. W. F. Walch*, loc. cit. p. 609, &c. and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 758, &c. Tr.]

(24) [*Florinus* and *Blastus*, were by the ancients, reckoned among the *Valentinians*. Both were presbyters of Rome, intimate friends, and excommunicated by the Roman bishop, *Eleutherius*. (*Euseb.* H. E. v. 15.) As *Florinus*, in early life, enjoyed the instruction of *Polycarp* at Smyrna, and as *Irenaeus* wrote a letter to *Blastus*, concerning the schism at Rome about Easter day; *C. W. F. Walch*, (loc. cit. p. 404,) supposes they both, and particularly *Blastus*, were opposed to the views of the Romish church respecting Easter. He also considers it most probable, that *Florinus* was inclined towards Gnosticism; for *Irenaeus* wrote a book against him, concerning the eight Aeons; and he actually had some followers. *Schl.*—That *Florinus* was a Gnostic, is clear from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. c. 20. That *Blastus* was so, is not so certain. Tr.]

which one *Euphrates* is said to be the father. The sect originated among the Jews, before the christian era. A part of them became professed christians; the rest retained their former superstition. Hence there were two sects of Ophites, a christian sect, and an anti-christian. The christian Ophites held nearly the same absurd notions, with the other Egyptian Gnostics, concerning Aeons, the eternity of matter, the creation of the world without the knowledge or consent of the Deity, the rulers of the seven planets who presided over the world, the tyranny of *Demiurgus*, the descent of *Christ* joined to the man *Jesus* into our world to overthrow the kingdom of *Demiurgus*, &c. But they held this peculiarity, that they supposed the *serpent* which deceived our first parents, was either *Christ* himself, or *Sophia*, concealed under the form of a serpent: and this opinion, is said to have induced them to keep some sacred serpents, and to pay them a species of honor. Into such absurdities men might easily fall, if they believed the Creator of the world to be a different being from the supreme God, and regarded as divine whatever was opposed to the pleasure of *Demiurgus*.(25)

(25) The history and doctrines of this sect, so far as they are known, I have stated in a German work, printed at Helmstadt, 1746. 4. [bearing the title: *Ers-ter Versuch einer unpartheyischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte*. Afterwards, *J. H. Schumacher* published an Explanation of the obscure and difficult Doctrinal Table of the ancient Ophites; Wolfenbüttel, 1756. 4to.—Schumacher maintained, that the doctrine of the Ophites embraced neither metaphysics nor theology, but merely the history of the Jewish nation couched in hieroglyphics.—*C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 447—481. has epitomized both works; and we here give his leading thoughts, in further illustration of this sect.—These people, called in Gr. *Ophites*, in Latin *Serpentians*, were by the Asiatics called *Nahassians* or *Naasians*. *Irenaeus*, (L. ii. c. 34;) the author of the supplement to *Tertullian's* book, *de Praescript. haeret.* (c. 47;) *Epiphanius*, (*Haeres.* xxxvii;) *Theodoret*, (*Haeret. Fabul.* L. i. c. 14;) and *Augustine*, (*de Haeres.* c. 17;) account them *christian* heretics. But *Origen*, (*contra Celsum*, L. vii. § 28.) holds them to be not christians. Yet he speaks of them as pretended christians, in his *Comment. on Matth.* tom. iii. p. 851, &c.—*Philastrius* makes them more ancient than christianity. It is most probable, they were Jewish Gnostics. and that some of them embraced christianity; so that the sect became divided into *Jewish* and *christian Ophites*. There are two sources of information on this part of ecclesiastical history. The *first*, is the accounts of *Irenaeus*, *Epiphanius*, and others. The *second*, is what *Origen* tells us (*contra Celsum*, Lib. vi. § 33, &c.) concerning the *Diagram* of the Ophites. This *Diagram* was a tablet, on which the Ophites depicted their doctrines, in all sorts of figures, with words annexed. It probably contained the doctrines of the Jewish Ophites, and is dark and unintelligible, unless we may suppose this symbolical representation contained that system, the principal doctrines of which are stated by the ancients. The theological system, both of the Jewish and the christian Ophites, can not be epitomized, and must be sought for in *Walch*, p. 461.—Their serpent-worship consisted in this; they kept a living serpent, which they let out upon the dish, when celebrating the Lord's supper, to crawl around and over the bread. The priest to whom the serpent belonged, now came near, brake the bread, and distributed to those present. When each had eaten his morsel, he kissed the serpent, which was afterwards confined. When this solemn act, which the Ophites called their perfect sacrifice, was ended, the meeting closed with a hymn of praise to the supreme God, whom the serpent in Paradise had made known to men. But all the Ophites did not observe these rites, which were peculiar to the christian Ophites, and confined to a small number among

§ 20. The numerous evils and discords, which arose from combining the oriental and Egyptian philosophy with the christian religion, began to be increased about the middle of this century, by those who brought the Grecian philosophy with them into the christian church. As the doctrines held by the christians respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and respecting the twofold nature of the Savior, were least of all at agreement with the precepts of this philosophy, they first endeavored so to explain these doctrines, that they could be comprehended by reason. This was attempted by one *Praxeas*, a very distinguished man and a confessor, at Rome. Discarding all real distinction between the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, he taught that the whole Father of all things joined himself to the human nature of *Christ*. Hence his followers were called *Monarchians* and *Patripassians*. Nor was the latter an unsuitable name for them, if *Tertullian* correctly understood their sentiments. For they denominated the *man*, Christ, the *Son* of God; and held, that to this Son, the *Father* of the universe, or God, so joined himself, as to be crucified and endure pangs along with the Son. Yet *Praxeas* does not appear to have erected a distinct church.(26)

§ 21. Nearly allied to this opinion, was that which was advanced about the same time, at Rome, by *Theodotus*, a tanner, yet a man of learning and a philosopher; and by one *Artemas* or *Artemon*, from whom originated the *Artemonites*. For, so far as can be gathered from not very distinct accounts of these men left us by the ancients, they supposed, that when the *man Christ* was born, a certain *divine energy*, or some portion of the divine nature (and not the *person* of the Father, as *Praxeas* imagined) united itself to him. Which of these men preceded the other, in

them. This worship must have been symbolic. The Ophites had also *Talismans*. *Schl.*—See a lucid account of the Ophites, in *A. Neander's Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 746—756 *Tr.*]

(26) See *Tertullian*, *Liber contra Praxeam*; and compare *Peter Wesseling*, *Probabilia*, cap. 26. p. 223, &c. [*Tertullian* (to whom we are indebted for all certain knowledge of the views of *Praxeas*,) was not only an obscure writer, but also a prejudiced one in regard to *Praxeas*. He not only rejected his doctrine, but hated him; because *Praxeas* had alienated the Roman bishop *Victor* from *Montanus*, whose partisan *Tertullian* was. Hence *Tertullian*, in his censures on *Praxeas*, is often extravagant and insulting. The opposition of *Praxeas* to *Montanus*, doubtless led the former into his error. *Montanus* had treated of the doctrine of three persons in the divine essence, and had insisted on a real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (*Tertullian contra Praxeam*, c. 13. p. 426.) *Praxeas*, who was hostile to *Montanus*, published his own doctrine in opposition to *Montanus*. From *Tertullian*, moreover, it appears clearly, that *Praxeas* discarded the distinction of persons in the divine essence; and, as *Tertullian* expresses it, contended for the *monarchy* of God. But how he explained what the scriptures teach, concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit, is not so clear. Of the various conceptions we might gather from *Tertullian*, *Mosheim* gives a full investigation, in his *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 426. See also *C. W. F. Walch*, *Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 527—546." *Schl.* See also *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. Pt. iii. p. 994. &c. *Tr.*]

time; and whether they both taught the same doctrine, or differed from each other; can not at this day be decided, so few and obscure are the ancient accounts we have of them. But this is unquestionable, the disciples of them both applied philosophy and geometry to the explication of the christian doctrine.(27)

§ 22. The same attachment to philosophy induced *Hermogenes*, a painter, to depart from the sentiments of christians, respecting the origin of the world and the nature of the soul, and to cause disturbance in a part of the christian community. Regarding *matter* as the source of all evil, he could not believe, that God had brought it into existence, by his omnipotent volition. He therefore held, that the world, and whatever is in the world, and also souls and spirits, were formed by the Deity out of *eternal* and vicious matter. There is much in this doctrine very difficult to be explained, and not in accordance with the common opinions of christians. But neither *Tertullian*, who wrote against him, nor others of the ancients, inform us how he explained those christian doctrines which are repugnant to his opinions.(28)

(27) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. c. 28. *Epiphanius*, Haeres. liv. p. 464. *P. Wesseling*, Probabilia, c. 21. p. 172 &c. [Several persons occur in the history of the heretics, bearing the name of *Theodotus*. (1) *Theodotus of Byzantium*, a tanner; of whom above. (2) *Theodotus the younger*, disciple of the former, and founder of the sect of Melchisedeckians. This sect derived its name from its holding, agreeably to the doctrine of the elder *Theodotus*, that *Melchisedec* was the power of God, and superior to *Christ*; and that he sustained the office of an Intercessor for the angels in heaven, as *Christ* did for us men on earth. (3) *Theodotus, the Valentinian*. (4) *Theodotus, the Montanist*—Our *Theodotus* had saved his life, during a persecution at Byzantium, by a denial of *Christ*; and thus had incurred general contempt. To escape from disgrace, he went to Rome. But there his offence became known. To extenuate his fault, he gave out that he regarded Jesus Christ as a mere man, and that it could be no great crime to deny a mere man. He was therefore excluded from the church, by *Victor* the bishop. Thus *Theodotus* came near to the system of the *Socinians*, and held *Christ* for a mere man, though a virtuous and upright one. Whether he held the birth of *Christ* to have been natural or supernatural, the ancient accounts are not agreed. He rejected the Gospel of *John*; and held his own doctrine to be apostolical, and that of the eternal divinity of *Christ* to be a novel doctrine. See *C. W. F. Walch*, loc. cit. p. 546—557.—*Artemon* has, in modern times, become more famous than *Theodotus*; since *Samuel Crell* assumed the name of an *Artemonite*, in order to distinguish himself from the odious Socinians, whose doctrines he did not fully approve. (See his book, with the title: *L. M. Artemonii Initium Evangelii Johannis ex antiquitate restitutum*; and his other writings.) The history of this *Artemon* is very obscure. The time when he lived cannot be definitely ascertained; and the history of his doctrine is not without difficulties. It is not doubted that he denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, as held by orthodox christians. But whether he swerved towards the system of the modern Socinians, or to that of *Praxeas*, is another question. *Dr. Mosheim* believed the latter; de Rebus Christ. &c. 491. But, as this rests on the recent testimony of *Gennadius* of Marseilles, (de Dogm. Eccles. c. 3) *Dr. Walch* (p. 564,) calls it in question. See also *Jo. Erh. Rappen*, Diss. de hist. Artimonis et Artemonitarum, Lips. 1737. Schl.—See also *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. iii. p. 996—1000. Tr.]

(28) There is extant a tract of *Tertullian*, Liber contra Hermogenem, in which he assails the doctrine of *Hermogenes* concerning matter and the origin of the world. But another tract of his, de Censu animæ, in which he confuted the opinion of *Hermogenes* concerning the soul, is lost. [*Tertullian* is exceedingly severe upon *Hermogenes*, who was probably his contemporary, and fellow African.

§ 23. In addition to the sects, which may be called the daughters of philosophy, there arose in the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, an illiterate sect, opposed to all learning and philosophy. An obscure man, of weak judgment, named *Montanus*, who lived in a poor village of Phrygia called Pepuza, had the folly to suppose himself the *Comforter*, promised by *Christ* to his disciples, and to pretend to utter prophecies under divine inspiration.(29) He attempted no change in the doctrines of religion; but professed to be divinely commissioned to perfect and give efficiency to the moral discipline taught by *Christ* and his apostles: for he supposed, *Christ* and his apostles had conceded too much to the weakness of the people of their age, and thus had given only an incomplete and imperfect rule of life. He therefore would have fasts multiplied and extended, forbid second marriages as illicit, did not allow churches to grant absolution to such as had fallen into the greater sins, condemned all decoration of the body and female ornaments, required polite learning and philosophy to be banished from the church, ordered virgins to be veiled, and maintained that christians sin most grievously, by rescuing their lives by flight or redeeming them with money in time of persecution. I pass by some other of his austere and rigid precepts.

§ 24. A man who professed to be a holier moralist than *Christ* himself, and who would obtrude his severe precepts upon christians for divine commands and oracles, could not be endured in the christian church. Besides, his dismal predictions of the speedy downfall of the Roman republic, &c. might bring the

Yet he allows that he was an ingenious and eloquent man, and sound in the principal doctrines of christianity. It seems, the morals of *Hermogenes* gave most offence to *Tertullian*. He had married repeatedly, and he painted for all customers what they wished. To a Montanist these things were exceedingly criminal. There is no evidence that *Hermogenes* founded a sect.—See *Moshcim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 432 &c. C. W. F. Walch, Hist. der Ketzer. vol. i. p. 476 &c. and A. Neander, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. iii. p. 976 &c. Tr.]

(29) They doubtless err, who tell us that *Montanus* claimed to be the Holy Spirit. He was not so foolish. Nor do those correctly understand his views, whom I have hitherto followed, and who represent him as asserting, that there was divinely imparted to him, that very Holy Spirit or Comforter, who once inspired and animated the apostles. *Montanus* distinguished the *Paraclete* promised by *Christ* to the apostles, from the Holy Spirit that was poured upon them; and held, that under the name of the *Paraclete*, *Christ* indicated a divine teacher, who would supply certain parts of the religious system which were omitted by the Savior, and explain more clearly certain other parts, which for wise reasons had been less perfectly taught. Nor was *Montanus* alone, in making this distinction. For other christian doctors supposed the *Paraclete*, whose coming *Christ* had promised, was a divine messenger to men, and different from the Holy Spirit given to the apostles. In the third century, *Munes* interpreted the promise of *Christ* concerning the *Paraclete*, in the same manner; and boasted that he himself was that *Paraclete*. And who does not know, that *Muhammed* had the same views, and applied the words of *Christ* respecting the *Paraclete*, to himself? *Montanus*, therefore, wished to be thought to be that *Paraclete* of *Christ*, and not the Holy Spirit. The more carefully and attentively we read *Tertullian*, the greatest of all *Montanus*' disciples, and the best acquainted with his system, the more clearly will it appear, that such were his views.

christian community into imminent danger. He was therefore, first by the decisions of some councils, and afterwards by that of the whole church, excluded from all connexion with that body. But the severity of his discipline itself led many persons of no mean condition, to put confidence in him. Pre-eminent among these, were two opulent ladies, *Priscilla* and *Maximilla*; who themselves, with others, uttered prophecies, after the example of their master, whom they denominated the *Paraclete* or *Comforter*. Hence it was easy for *Montanus* to found a new church, which was first established at *Pepuza*, a little town of Phrygia, but which spread in process of time through Asia, Africa, and a part of Europe. Of all his followers, the most learned and distinguished, was *Tertullian*, a man of genius, but austere and gloomy by nature; who defended the cause of his preceptor, by many energetic and severe publications.(30)

(30) See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. v. cap. 16. and especially *Tertullian*, in his numerous books; and then all writers, both ancient and modern, who have treated professedly of the sects of the early ages. Quite recently, and with attention and great erudition, the history of the Montanists has been illustrated by *Theoph. Wernsdorf*, in his *Commentatio de Montanistis sæculi secundi vulgo creditis hæreticis*. Dantzik, 1751. 4to —[The Montanists were also called *Phrygians*, or *Cataphrygians*, from the country where they resided and originated; also *Pepusians*, from the town where *Montanus* had his habitation, and which he pretended was the *New Jerusalem* spoken of in the Revelation of St. John. It appears likewise, that from *Priscilla*, they were called *Priscillianists*; though this name, on account of its ambiguity, has in modern times been disused. *Tertullian* denominated those of his faith, the *Spiritual* (*Spirituales*); and its opposers, the *Carnal* (*Psychikoi*); because the former admitted *Montanus*' inspirations of the Holy Spirit, which the latter rejected.—The time when *Montanus* began to disturb the church, is much debated. Those who follow *Eusebius*, who is most to be relied upon, place this movement in the year 171, or 172. *Wernsdorf*'s conjecture that *Montanus* was the bishop of *Pepuza*, is not improbable. He and *Priscilla* and *Maximilla* pretended to have divine revelations, which the *Paraclete* imparted to them, in order to supply by them what further instruction the christian church needed. The instruction, said they, which the Holy Spirit gives to men, is progressive. In the Old Testament, instruction was in its infancy. *Christ* and his apostles advanced it to its youthful stature. By *Montanus* and his coadjutors, it is brought to its perfect manhood. In the Old Testament God conceded much to the hardness of the people's hearts, and *Christ* was indulgent to the weakness of the flesh, but the *Comforter* is unsparing to both, and presents the virtues of christians in their full splendor.—Their revelations related to no new doctrines of faith, but only to rules of practice. Some of them too, were historical. But all these revelations seem to have been the effect of their melancholy temperament, and of an excessively active imagination.—See, concerning *Tertullian*, *Hamberger*'s account of the principal writers, vol. ii. p. 492. and *J. G. Walch*, Hist. Eccles. N. Test. p. 648, &c. and concerning the *Montanists*, *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 611, &c. *Schl.*—Also *J. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. iii. p. 870—893, *Tr.*]

CENTURY THIRD.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Rights and immunities of christians enlarged.—§ 2. Under various emperors. Good will of Alexander towards Christ.—§ 3. Other emperors favorable to the christians. The religion of the emperor Philip.—§ 4. The number of christians augmented: from causes, partly, divine,—§ 5. and, partly, human. § 6. Countries added to the kingdom of Christ.—§ 7. State of the church in France, Germany.

§ 1. That christians suffered very great evils in this century, and were in perfect security during no part of it, admits of no controversy. For, not to mention the popular tumults raised against them by the pagan priests, the governors and magistrates could persecute them, without violating the imperial laws, as often as either superstition or avarice or cruelty prompted. Yet, it is no less certain, that the rights and liberties of the christians were increased, more than many have supposed. In the army, in the court, and among all ranks, there were many christians, whom no one molested at all; and under most of the Roman emperors who reigned in this century, christianity presented no obstacle to the attainment of public stations and honors. In many places also, with the full knowledge of the emperors and magistrates, they had certain houses in which they regularly assembled for the worship of God. Yet it is probable, or rather, is more than probable, that the christians commonly purchased this security and these liberties, with money; although some of the emperors had very kind feelings towards them, and were not greatly opposed to their religion.

§ 2. *Antoninus*, surnamed *Caracalla*, the son of *Severus*, came to the throne in the year 211; and during the six years of his reign, he neither oppressed the christians himself, nor suffered

others to oppress them.(1) *Antoninus Heliogabalus*, [AD. 218—222,] though of a most abandoned moral character, had no hostility towards the christians.(2) His successor, *Alexander Severus*, [AD. 222—235—,] an excellent prince, did not indeed repeal the laws which had been enacted against the christians, so that instances occur of christians' suffering death in his reign; yet from the influence of his mother, *Julia Mamaea*, to whom he was greatly attached, he showed kind feelings towards them in various ways, and whenever occasion was offered; and even paid some worship and honor to our Savior.(3) For *Julia* entertained the most favorable sentiments of the christian religion; and at one time invited to the court, *Origen*, the celebrated christian doctor, that she might hear him discourse. But those who conclude, that *Julia* and *Alexander* actually embraced christianity, have not testimony to adduce, which is unexceptionable. Yet it is certain, that *Alexander* thought the christian religion deserved toleration, beyond others; and regarded its author as worthy to be ranked among the extraordinary men who were divinely moved.(4)

§ 3. Under *Gordian* [AD. 236—244,] the christians lived in tranquillity. His successors, the *Philips*, father and son, [AD. 244—249,] showed themselves so friendly to the christians, that by many, they were supposed to be christians. And there are

(1) [From a passage in *Tertullian*, (ad Scapul. cap. 4.) asserting that *Caracalla* had a christian nurse: lacte christiano educatum fuisse; and from one in *Spartianus*, (life of *Caracalla*, in *Scriptor. Histor. Aug.* vol. i. p. 707. cap. 1.) asserting that he was much attached to a Jewish play fellow, when he was seven years old; it has been inferred that he was half a christian, and on that account was indulgent to the followers of *Christ*. But it is much more probable, that they purchased his indulgence with their gold. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 460. Tr.]

(2) *Lampridius*, vita *Heliogabali*, cap. 3. p. 796. [Dicebat praeterea (Imperator) *Judaeorum et Samaritanorum religiones et Christianam devotionem illuc (Romam) transferendam, ut omnium cultarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret*: which *Dr. Mosheim*, (de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 460,) understands to mean, that *Heliogabalus* wished the Jewish, Samaritan, and christian religions to be freely tolerated at Rome, so that the priests of his order might understand all the arcana of them, having them daily before their eyes. Tr.]

(3) See *Lampridius*, de Vita *Severi*, c. 29. p. 930. and *Car. Hen. Zeibich*, Diss. de Christo ab *Alexandro* in larario culto; which is found in the *Miscell. Lips. novae*, tom. iii. p. 42, &c. [Most of the modern writers make *Julia Mamaea* to have been a christian. See *J. R. Wetstein's* preface to *Origen's Dial. contra Marcionitas*. But the ancient writers; *Eusebius* (H. E. vi. 21,) and *Jerome* (de *Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 54.) express themselves dubiously. The former calls her Θεοσεβέστρατην, and the latter *religiosam* (devout); and both state that she invited *Origen* to her court, then at Antioch, in order to hear him discourse on religion. But neither of them intimates, that she obeyed his precepts and adopted the christian faith. And in the life of *Julia*, there are clear indications of superstition, and of reverence for the pagan gods. Schl. from *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 461.]

(4) See *Fred. Spanheim*, Diss. de *Lucii Britonum regis, Juliae Mamaeae, et Philipporum, conversionibus*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 400. *P. E. Jablonski*, Diss. de *Alexandro Severo sacris Christianis per Gnosticos initiato*, in *Miscellan. Lips. nov.* tom. iv. p. 56, &c.

arguments which may render it probable, that these emperors did, though secretly and covertly, embrace christianity. But as these arguments are balanced by others equally strong and imposing, the question respecting the religion of *Philip*, the Arabian, and his son, which has exercised the sagacity of so many learned men, must be left undecided.(5) At least, neither party has adduced any evidence, either from testimony or from facts, which was too strong to be invalidated. Among the subsequent emperors of this century, *Gallienus*, [AD. 260—268,] and some others likewise, if they did not directly favor the christian cause, they at least did not retard it.

§ 4. This friendship of great men, and especially of emperors, was undoubtedly not the least among the human causes, which contributed to enlarge the boundaries of the church. But other causes, and some of them divine, must be added. Among the *divine* causes, besides the inherent energy of heavenly truth, and the piety and constancy of the christian teachers; especially noticeable, is that extraordinary providence of God, which we are informed, excited many persons, by means of dreams and visions, who before were either wholly thoughtless, or alienated from christianity, to come out at once and enrol their names among the followers of *Christ*.(6) To this must be added, the curing of diseases, and other miracles, which very many christians still performed, by invoking the name of the Savior.(7) Yet the number of miracles was less in this age, than in the preceding; which may be ascribed not only to the wisdom of God, but also to his justice, which would not suffer men to make gain by the powers divinely given them.(8)

§ 5. Among the *human* causes which aided the progress of christianity, may doubtless be reckoned the translation of the Scriptures into various languages, the labours of *Origen* in disseminating copies of them, and various books composed by wise men. No less efficacy is to be ascribed to the beneficence of christians, towards those whose religion they abhorred. The idolaters must have had hearts of stone, not to have been softened

(5) See *Spanheim*, de Christianismo Philipporum, Opp. tom. ii. p. 400. (*P. de la Faye*,) Entretiens historiques sur la Christianisme de l'Empereur Philippe, Utrecht, 1692. 12mo. *Mammaehius*, Origines et Antiq. Christianae, tom. ii. p. 252, &c. See *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, p. 252, &c. [and *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 471.—The most important ancient testimonies, are *Euseb.* H. E. vi. 34. and *Chronicon*, ann. 246. *Jerome*, de Script. Illust. c. 54. Tr.]

(6) See *Origen*, adv. Celsum, Lib. I. p. 35. Homil. in Lucae vii. Opp. tom. ii. p. 216. ed. Basil. *Tertullian*, de Anima, cap. 14. p. 348. ed. Rigaltii. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 5. and others. [See also, Note (14) on Cent. II. Pt. 1. ch. I. p. 125, &c. of this work. Tr.]

(7) *Origen*, adv. Celsum, L. I. p. 5, 7. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. L. v. c. 7. *Cyprian*, Ep. I. ad Donatum, p. 3. and the Note of *S. Baluze*, there, p. 376.

(8) *W. Spencer*, Notes on *Origen* adv. Celsum, p. 6, 7.

and brought to have more friendly feelings towards the people, whose great sympathy for the poor, kindness to enemies, care of the sick, readiness to redeem captives, and numerous other kind offices, proved them to be deserving of the love and gratitude of mankind. If, what I would not pertinaciously deny, pious frauds and impositions deserve a place among the causes of the extension of christianity, they doubtless hold the lowest place, and were employed only by a few.

§ 6. That the boundaries of the church were extended, in this century, no one calls in question; but in what manner, by whom, and in what countries, is not equally manifest. *Origen* taught the religion he professed to a tribe of Arabs: I suppose, they were some of the wandering Arabs, who live in tents.(9) The Goths, a ferocious and warlike people, that inhabited Moe-sia and Thrace, and made perpetual incursions into the neighboring provinces; received a knowledge of *Christ*, from certain christian priests whom they carried away from Asia. As those priests, by the sanctity of their lives, and their miracles, acquired respectability and authority among these marauders, who were entirely illiterate; such a change was produced among them, that a great part of the nation professed christianity, and in some measure laid aside their savage manners.(10)

§ 7. To the few and small christian churches in France, erected in the second century, by certain Asiatic teachers, more and larger ones were added in this century, after the times of *Decius*, [AD. 250]. In the reign of this emperor, those seven devout men, *Dionysius*, *Gratian*, *Trophimus*, *Paul*, *Saturninus*, *Martial*, and *Stremonius*, migrated to this country; and amidst various perils founded the churches of *Paris*, *Tours*, *Arles*, [*Narbonne*, *Toulouse*, *Limoges*, *Clermont*,] and other places. And their disciples gradually spread the christian doctrine throughout Gaul.(11) To this age, likewise, must be referred the origin of the German churches, of *Cologne*, *Treves*, *Metz*, [*Tongres*, *Liege*,] and others; the fathers of which, were *Eucharis*, *Va-*

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. cap. 19. [But *Semler*, Hist. Eccl. selecta cap. i. p. 59, supposes they were not wandering Arabs. Tr.]

(10) *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. c. 6. *Paul Diaconus*, Hist. miscellan. L. ii. c. 14. *Philostorgius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. c. 5. [*Philostorgius* says, that *Ulphilas*, who in the fourth century translated the christian scriptures into the Gothic language, was a descendant of the captives carried off by the Goths from Cappadocia, in the reign of *Gallienus*; which is not improbable. By the influence of their christian captives, the Goths were induced to invite christian teachers among them; and numerous churches were collected. A Gothic bishop, named *Theophilus*, subscribed the Acts of the council of Nice, (*Socrates*, Hist. Eccl. ii. c. 41.) Yet there is indubitable evidence, that a large part of the nation remained pagans, long after this period. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 449. Tr.]

(11) *Gregory Turonens*. Historia Francor. Lib. i. c. 28. p. 23. *Theod. Ruinart*, Acta Martyrum sincera, p. 109, &c. [See Note (9), on Cent. ii. Pt. i. ch. i. p. 123 of this work; where the origin of the Gallic or French churches, is considered, at some length. Tr.]

lerius, Maternus, Clement, and others.(12) The Scotch also say, that their country was enlightened with the light of christianity, in this century; which does not appear improbable in itself, but can not be put beyond controversy, by any certain testimony.(13)

(12) *Aug. Calmet*, Histoire de Lorraine, tome i. Diss. i. p vii. &c. *Jo. Nicol. de Hontheim*, Historia Trevirensis. [See also, Notes (6) and (7) on Cent. i. Pt. i. ch. i. p. 121. of this work. *Tr.*]

(13) See *Usher* and *Stillingsfleet*, on the Origin and Antiquities of the British churches; and *Geo. Mackenzie*, de Regali Scotorum prosapia, cap. viii. p. 119, &c.

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The persecution of Severus.—§ 2. of Maximinus, the Thracian.—§ 3. The cruelty of Decius led many christians to deny Christ.—§ 4. Controversies in the church on this subject, *Libelli pacis*.—§ 5. Persecutions of Gallus and Volusian.—§ 6. of Valerian.—§ 7. State of the church under Gallienus, Claudius, and Aurelian.—§ 8. Attempts of the philosophers against the christians.—§ 9. Comparisons of some philosophers with Christ.—§ 10. Injury thence arising.—§ 11. Attempts of the Jews against the christians.

§ 1. In the commencement of this century, the christians were variously afflicted, in many of the Roman provinces; but their calamity was increased in the year 203, when the emperor *Severus*, who was otherwise not hostile to them, enacted a law, that no person should abandon the religion of his fathers, for that of the christians, or even for that of the Jews.(1) Although this law did not condemn the [existing] christians, but merely restrained the propagation of their religion, yet it afforded to rapacious and unjust governors and judges great opportunity for troubling the christians, and for putting many of the poor to death, in order to induce the rich to avert their danger by donations. Hence, after the passing of this law, very many christians in Egypt, and in other parts of both Asia and Africa, were cruelly slain; and among them were *Leonidas*, the father of *Origen*; the two celebrated African ladies, *Perpetua* and *Felicitas*, whose Acts [martyrdom] have come down to us;(2) also *Potamiena*, a virgin; *Marcella*, and others of both sexes, whose names were held in high honor in the subsequent ages.

§ 2. From the death of [*Septimius*] *Severus*, till the reign of *Maximin*, called *Thrax*, from the country which gave him birth, [or, from AD. 211 to AD. 235,] the condition of christians was, every where, tolerable, and in some places prosperous. But *Maximin*, who had slain *Alexander Severus*, an emperor peculiarly friendly to the christians, fearing lest the christians should avenge the death of their patron, ordered their bishops, and particularly those that he knew had been the friends and intimates of *Alexander*, to be seized and put to death.(3) During his reign therefore, many

(1) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. i. *Spartianus*, Vita Severi, cap. 16, 17.

(2) *Theod. Ruinart*, Acta martyrum sincera, p. 90, &c. [See an affecting account of the sufferings of these and other martyrs, in the reign of Severus, in *Milner's* Hist. of the church, Cent. iii. ch. v. p. 231, &c. ed. Boston, 1822. Tr.]

(3) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 28. *Orosius*, Histor. Lib. vii. c. 19. p. 509.

and atrocious injuries were brought upon the christians. For although the edict of the tyrant related only to the bishops, and the ministers of religion, yet its influence reached farther, and incited the pagan priests, the populace, and the magistrates to assail christians of all orders.(4)

§ 3. This storm was followed by many years of peace and tranquillity. [From AD. 237—249.] But when *Decius Trajan* came to the imperial throne, AD. 249, war, in all its horrors, again burst upon the christians. For this emperor, excited either by fear of the christians, or by attachment to the ancient superstition, published terrible edicts, by which the governors were commanded, on pain of forfeiting their own lives, either to exterminate all christians utterly, or bring them back by pains and tortures to the religion of their fathers. During the two succeeding years, a great multitude of christians, in all the Roman provinces, were cut off by various species of punishment and suffering.(5) This persecution was more cruel and terrific than any that preceded it; and immense numbers, dismayed, not so much by the fear of death, as by the dread of the long continued tortures, by which the magistrates endeavored to overcome the constancy of christians, professed to renounce *Christ*; and procured for themselves safety, either by sacrificing, i. e. offering incense before the idols, or by certificates purchased with money. And hence arose the opprobrious names of *Sacrificers*, *Incensers*, and the *Certificated*, (*Sacrificatores*, *Thurificatores*, and *Libellatici*,) names by which the lapsed were designated.(6)

§ 4. From the multitude of christians chargeable with defection, in the reign of *Decius*, great commotions and sharp contests arose in different parts of the church. For the lapsed wished to

(4) *Origen*, tom. xxviii. in *Matth.* Opp. tom. i. p. 137. *Firmilian*, in Opp. *Cypriani*, Ep. 75. p. 140. &c.

(5) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 39, 41. *Gregory Nyssen*, Vita *Thaumaturgi*, Opp. tom. iii. p. 568. &c. *Cyprian*, de Lapsis, in Opp. pa. 182 &c. [*Eusebius* attributes the persecution by *Decius*, to his hatred of *Philip*, his predecessor, whom he had murdered, and who was friendly to the christians. *Gregory* attributes it to the emperor's zeal for idolatry. Both causes might have prompted him.—The persecuting *Edict* is not now extant; that, which was published by *Medon*, Toulouse, 1664, 4to. is probably unauthentic. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 476. &c. Tr.]

(6) See *Prudentius Maran*, Life of *Cyprian*, prefixed to *Cypriani* Opp § vi. p. liv, &c. [For an interesting account of the sufferings of christians in this persecution, the English reader is referred to *Milner's* Hist. of the church, Cent. iii. ch. 8. p. 257. and ch. 11. p. 293. ed. Boston, 1822. vol. i.—This persecution was more terrible than any preceding one, because it extended over the whole empire, and because its object was to worry the christians into apostasy by extreme and persevering torture.—The *Certificated*, or *Libellatici*, are supposed to be, such as purchased *certificates* from the corrupt magistrates, in which it was declared, that they were pagans, and had complied with the demands of the law, when neither of these was fact. To purchase such a certificate was not only to be partaker in a fraudulent transaction, but it was to prevaricate before the public in regard to christianity, and was inconsistent with that open confession of *Christ* before men, which he himself requires. On the purport of these letters, see *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 482—489. Tr.]

be restored to christian fellowship, without submitting to that severe *penitence* which the laws of the church prescribed; and some of the bishops favored their wishes, while others opposed them.(7) In Egypt and Africa, many persons, to obtain more ready pardon of their offences, resorted to the intercession of the *martyrs*, and obtained from them *letters of recommendation* (*libellos pacis*,) that is, papers in which the dying martyrs declared, that *they* considered the persons worthy of their communion, and wished them to be received and treated as brethren. Some bishops and presbyters were too ready to admit offenders, who produced such letters. But *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, a decided and strenuous man, though he was not disposed to derogate at all from the honor of the martyrs, was nevertheless opposed to this excessive lenity, and wished to limit the effects of these *letters of recommendation*. Hence there arose a sharp contest between him and the martyrs, confessors, presbyters, the lapsed and the people, which ended in his gaining the victory.(8)

§ 5. The successors of *Decius*, namely, *Gallus* and his son *Volusian*, (AD. 251—253,) renewed the persecution against the christians, which seemed to be subsiding:(9) and, as their edicts were accompanied by public calamities, particularly by a pestilential disease which spread through many provinces, the christians had again to undergo much suffering in divers countries.(10) For the pagan priests persuaded the populace, that the gods visited the people with so many calamities, on account of the christians.

(7) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 44. *Cyprian*. Epistolae, passim.

(8) *Gab. Albaspinæus*, Observat. Eccles. Lib. i. Obs. xx. p. 94. *Jo. Dallæus*, de poenis et satisfactionibus humanis, L. vii. c. 16. p. 706. The whole history of this controversy must be gathered from the Epistles of *Cyprian*. [*Tertullian*, de Pudicitia, cap. 22. and, ad Martyres, cap. 1. makes the earliest mention of these letters: whence it is conjectured, that they first began to be used about the middle of the *second* century.—By *martyrs* here, must be understood, persons already under sentence of death for their religion, or at least, such as had endured some suffering, and were still in prison and uncertain what would befall them. In that age, when martyrs were almost idolized, and the doctrines of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, imperfectly understood; the propriety of such letters was unquestioned, and their influence very great. Yet the abuses of them were felt by the more discerning. *Dr. Mosheim*, (de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 490—497,) has collected the following facts, respecting their misuse. (1) They were given, with little or no discrimination, to all applicants. *Cyprian* Ep. 14. p. 24. Ep. 10. p. 20.—(2) They often did not express definitely the names of the persons recommended, but said: "Receive A. B. (*cum suis*) and his friends." Ibid. Ep. 10. p. 20, 21.—(3) Sometimes a martyr, before his death, commissioned some friend, to give letters in his name, to all applicants. Ibid. Ep. 21. p. 30. Ep. 22. p. 31,—(4) Some presbyters, obeyed these letters, without consulting the bishop, and thus subverted ecclesiastical order. Ibid. Ep. 27. p. 38. Ep. 10. p. 20. Ep. 40. p. 52. Ep. 22. p. 31, 32. It is easy to see what effects would follow, when the almost deified martyrs, of every age and sex and condition, felt themselves to possess authority almost divine, and were besieged by a host of persons writhing under the rigors of the ancient discipline. Tr.]

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vii. c. 1. *Cyprian*, Ep. lvii. lviii.

(10) See *Cyprian*, Liber ad Demetrianum. [*Milner's* Hist. of the church, cent. iii. ch. 12. p. 308. Tr.]

The next emperor, *Valerian*, stilled the commotion, AD. 254, and restored tranquillity to the church.

§ 6. Till the fifth year of his reign, *Valerian* was very kind to the christians; but suddenly, in the year 257, by the persuasion of *Macrianus*, a most bigoted pagan, who was his prime minister, he prohibited the christians from holding meetings, and ordered the bishops and other teachers into exile. The next year he published a far more severe edict; so that no small number of christians, in all the provinces of the Roman empire, were put to death, and often exposed to punishments worse than death. Eminent among the martyrs in this tempest, were *Cyprian*, bp. of Carthage, *Sixtus*, bp. of Rome, *Laurentius*, a deacon at Rome, who was roasted before a slow fire, and others. But *Valerian* being taken captive, in a war against the Persians, his son *Gallienus*, in the year 260, restored peace to the church.(11)

§ 7. Under *Gallienus* therefore, who reigned with his brother eight years, [AD. 260—268,] and under his successor, *Claudius*, who reigned two years, [AD. 268—270,] the condition of the christians was tolerable, yet not altogether tranquil and happy. Nor did *Aurelian*, who came to the throne AD. 270, undertake to disquiet them, during four years. But in the fifth year of his reign, prompted either by his own superstition, or by that of others, he prepared for war against them. But before his edicts had been published over the whole empire, he was assassinated in Thrace, AD. 275.(12) Hence, few christians were cut off under him. The remainder of this century; if we except some few instances of the injustice, the avarice, or the superstition of the governors,(13) passed away, without any great troubles or injuries done to christians living among Romans.

§ 8. While the emperors and provincial governors were assailing christians with the sword and with edicts, the Phatonic philosophers, before described, fought them with disputations, books, and stratagems. And the more was to be feared from them, because they approved and adopted many doctrines and institutions of the christians, and, following the example of *Ammonius*, their master, attempted to amalgamate the old religion and the new. At the head of this sect, in this century, was *Porphyry*, a Syrian, or Tyrian; who composed a long work against the christians, which was afterwards destroyed, by the imperial laws.(14) He was un-

(11) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. cap. 10, 11. *Acta Cypriani*, in *Ruinart's Acta martyrum sincera*, p. 216. *Cyprian*, Epist. lxxvii. p. 178. Epist. lxxxii. p. 165. ed. Baluz. [*Milner's Hist. of the chh. cent. iii. ch. 16*, p. 347. Tr.]

(12) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 30. *Lactantius*, de Mortibus persecutor. cap. 6.

(13) One example is, the iniquity of the Caesar, *Galerius Maximian*, near the end of the century, who persecuted the soldiers and servants of his palace, that professed christianity. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. viii. cap. 1, and 4.

(14) See *Lu. Holstein*, de Vita Porphyrii, cap. 11. *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang.

doubtedly an acute, ingenious and learned man, as his works which are extant evince; but he was not a formidable enemy to the christians. For he had more imagination and superstition, than sound argument and judgment; as his books that remain, and the history of his life, will show; without recurrence to the fragments of his work against the christians which are preserved, and which are unworthy of a wise and upright man.

§ 9. Among the wiles and stratagems, by which this sect endeavored to subvert the authority of the christian religion, this deserves to be particularly mentioned, that they drew comparisons between the life, miracles, and transactions of our Savior, and the history of the ancient philosophers; and endeavored to persuade the unlearned and women, that these philosophers were in no respect inferior to *Christ*. With such views, *Archytas* of Tarentum, *Pythagoras*, and *Apollonius* Tyanaeus, a Pythagorean philosopher, were brought again upon the stage, and exhibited to the public dressed very much like *Christ* himself. The life of *Pythagoras* was written by *Porphyry*.⁽¹⁵⁾ The life of *Apollonius*, whose travels and prodigies were talked of by the vulgar, and who was a crafty mountebank, and the ape of *Pythagoras*, was composed by *Philostratus*, the first rhetorician of the age, in a style which is not inelegant. The reader of the work will readily perceive, that the philosopher is compared with our Savior; and yet he will wonder, that any man of sound sense could have been deceived by the base falsehoods and fictions of the writer.⁽¹⁶⁾

10. But as nothing is so irrational, but it can find patrons among the weak and ignorant, who regard words more than arguments; there were not a few who were ensnared by these silly attempts of the philosophers. Some were induced by these stratagems to abandon the christian religion which they had embraced. Others, being told that there was little difference be-

toti orbi exoriens, p. 154. *J. F. Buddeus*, Isagoge in Theologiam, Lib. ii. p. 877, &c. [and *Ja. Brucker's* Hist. crit. Philos. tom. ii. p. 236, &c. His fifteen Books against the christians were condemned to be burned, by *Theodosius II.* and *Valentinian III.* AD. 449. (see the Codex Justinianus de Summa Trinitate, L. i. Tit. i. cap. 3.) The work was answered by *Methodius*, *Eusebius*, *Apollinaris*, and *Philostorgius*; but the answers are lost. Of the work of *Porphyry*, extracts are preserved by *Eusebius*, *Jerome* and others. Tr.]

(15) [And in the next century, by *Jamblichus*. That both biographers had the same object, is shown by *Lud. Küster*, Adnot. ad Jamblich. cap. 2. p. 7. and cap. 19. p. 78. Schl.]

(16) See *Godfr. O'earius*, Praefat. ad Philostrati vitam Apollonii; and *Mosheim*, Notes on *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, p. 304, 309, 311, 834. [also *J. Brucker's* Historia crit. philos. tom. ii. 98 &c. and *Enfield's* Abridgement of *Brucker*, vol. ii. p. 42, &c. *N. Lardner's* Works, vol. viii. p. 256—292.—*Apollonius* was born about the beginning, and died near the close of the first century. He travelled over all the countries from Spain to India; and drew much attention by his sagacious remarks, and by his pretensions to superhuman knowledge and powers. He was a man of genius, but vainglorious and a great impostor. Tr.]

tween the ancient religion, rightly explained and restored to its purity, and the religion which *Christ* really taught, not that corrupted form of it which his disciples professed; concluded it best for them to remain among those who worshipped the [old] gods. Some were led by those comparisons of *Christ* with the ancient heroes and philosophers, to frame for themselves a kind of mixed or compound religion: Witness, among others, [the emperor] *Alexander Severus*; who esteemed *Christ*, and *Orpheus*, *Apolonius* and the like, all worthy of equal honors.

§ 11. The *Jews* were reduced so low, that they could not, as formerly, excite in the magistrates any great hatred against the christians. Yet they were not wholly inactive, as appears from the books written by *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* against them. There occur also in the christian fathers several complaints of the hatred and the machinations of the *Jews*.⁽¹⁷⁾ During the persecutions of *Severus*, one *Domnius* abandoned christianity for Judaism; undoubtedly, to avoid the punishments that were decreed against the christians. *Serapion* endeavored to recall him to his duty, by some epistles.⁽¹⁸⁾ This example shows, that while the christians were in trouble, the *Jews* were in safety: and therefore, though greatly depressed, they had not lost all power of doing injury to the christians.

(17) *Hyppolitus*, Sermo in Susann. et Daniel. Opp. tom. i. p. 274, 276.

(18) *Eusebius*, Historia Eccles. Lib. vi. cap. 12.

CENTURY THIRD.

PART II.

INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

STATE OF LEARNING AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. Decay of learning.—§ 2. State of philosophy, especially the Platonic, Plotinus.—§ 3. This philosophy prevails every where.—§ 4. Different sects of it.—§ 5. State of learning among christians.

§ 1. Literature, which had suffered much in the preceding century, in this lost nearly all of its glory. Among the Greeks, with the exception of *Dionysius Longinus*, an excellent rhetorician, *Dion Cassius*, a fine historian, and a few others, scarcely any writers appeared who can be recommended for their genius or their erudition. In the western provinces, still smaller was the number of men truly learned and eloquent, notwithstanding schools continued here and there devoted to the cultivation of genius. For very few of the emperors favored learning, civil wars kept the empire almost constantly in commotion, and the perpetual incursions of the barbarous nations into the most cultivated provinces, extinguished with the public tranquillity, even the thirst for knowledge.(1)

§ 2. As for the philosophers, about every sect of Grecian philosophy, had some adherents that were not contemptible, and who are in part mentioned by *Longinus*.(2) But the school of *Ammonius*, the origin of which has been already stated, gradually cast all others into the back ground. From Egypt it spread in a short time, over nearly the whole Roman empire ; and drew after it almost all persons inclined to attend to metaphysical studies. This prosperity of the sect was owing especially to *Plotinus*, the

(1) See *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, par les Moines Benedictins, tom. i. Pt. ii. p. 317, &c.

(2) In *Porphyry's* life of Plotinus, cap. 20. p. 128. ed. Fabricii.

most distinguished disciple of *Ammonius*, a man of intellectual acumen, and formed by nature for abstruse investigation. For he taught, first in Persia, then at Rome, and in Campania, to vast concourses of youth; and embodied precepts in various books, the greater part of which have come down to us.(3)

§ 3. It is almost incredible, what a number of pupils in a short time, issued from the school of this man. But among them, no one is more celebrated than *Porphyry*, a Syrian; who spread over Sicily and many other countries, the system of his master, enlarged with new discoveries and perfected.(4) At Alexandria almost no other philosophy was publicly taught, from the times of *Ammonius* down to the sixth century. It was introduced into Greece, by one *Plutarch*, who was educated at Alexandria, and who re-established the Academy at Athens, which subsequently embraced many very renowned philosophers, who will hereafter be mentioned.(5)

§ 4. The character of this philosophy has already been explained, as far as was compatible with the brevity of this work. It is here proper to add, that all who were addicted to it, did not hold the same opinions, but differed from each other on several points. This diversity naturally arose from that principle, which the whole sect kept in sight; namely, that truth was to be pursued without restraint, and to be gleaned out of all systems. Hence the Alexandrian philosophers sometimes would receive, what those of Athens would reject. Yet there were certain leading doctrines, which were fundamental to the system, that no one who claimed the name of a Platonist, dared to call in question. Such were the doctrines of one God, the source of all things, of the eternity of the world, of the dependence of matter on God, of the plurality of Gods, of the method of explaining the popular superstitions, and some others.

§ 5. The estimation in which human learning should be held, was a question on which the christians were about equally divided. For, while many thought that the literature and writings of the Greeks ought to receive attention; there were others who contended, that true piety and religion were endangered by such studies. But the friends of philosophy and literature gradually acquired the ascendancy. To this issue *Origen* contributed very much: who, having early imbibed the principles of the New Pla-

(3) See *Porphyrii Vita Plotini*, republished by *J. A. Fabricius*, in *Biblioth. Graeca*, vol. iv. p. 91. *Peter Bayle*, *Dictionaire*, tom. iii. v. *Plotinus*, p. 2330; and the learned *Ja. Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.* tom. ii. p. 217, &c.

(4) *Lu. Holstenius*, *Vita Porphyrii*, republished by *Fabricius*, in *Biblioth. Gr.*—[“*Porphyry* was first the disciple of *Longinus*, author of the justly celebrated *Treatise on the sublime*. But having passed from Greece to Rome, where he heard *Plotinus*, he was so charmed with the genius and penetration of this philosopher, that he attached himself entirely to him. See *Plotin. Vit.* p. 3. *Eunap. c. 2.* p. 17.” *Macl.*]

(5) *Marinus*, *Vita Procli*, cap. 11, 12. p. 25. &c.

tonism, inauspiciously applied them to theology, and earnestly recommended them to the numerous youth who attended on his instructions. And the greater the influence of this man, which quickly spread over the whole christian world, the more readily was his method of explaining the sacred doctrines propagated. Some also of the disciples of *Plotinus*, connected themselves with the christians, yet retained the leading sentiments of their master : (6) and these undoubtedly, labored to disseminate their principles around them, and to instil them into the minds of the uninformed.

(6) *Augustine*, *Epistola lvi. ad Dioscor.* Opp. tom. ii. p. 260.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Form of the government of the church.—§ 2. What rank the bishop of Rome held in this century.—§ 3. Gradual progress towards a hierarchy.—§ 4. The vices of the clergy.—§ 5. Hence the inferior orders of the clergy.—§ 6. Marriage of the clergy. Their concubines.—§ 7. The principal writers ; Grecian and oriental.—§ 8. Latin writers.

§ 1. The form of the ecclesiastical constitution and government which had been introduced, was more and more confirmed and strengthened, both in respect to individual churches and the whole society of christians. He must be ignorant of the history and the monuments of this age, who can deny, that a person bearing the title of *bishop* presided over each church in the larger cities, and managed its public concerns with some degree of authority ; yet having the *presbyters* for his counsel ; and taking the voice of the whole people on subjects of considerable moment.(1) It is equally certain, that one bishop in each province, was preeminent over the rest in rank and authority. This was necessary for maintaining that consociation of churches, which had been introduced in the preceding century, and for the more convenient regulation of the system of councils. Yet it must be added, that the prerogatives of these principal bishops were not every where accurately ascertained ; nor did the bishop of the chief city in a province, always hold the rank of first bishop. This also is beyond controversy, that the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, as presiding over the primitive and apostolic churches in the greater divisions of the empire, had precedence of all others, and were not only often consulted on weighty affairs, but likewise enjoyed certain prerogatives peculiar to themselves.

(1) Authorities are cited by *David Blondell*, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronimi de episcopis et presbyteris*, p. 136 &c.—[and still more amply, by *James Boileau*, under the fictitious name of *Claudius Fonteius*, in his book *de antiquo jure presbyterorum in regimine ecclesiastico*, Turin, 1676, 12mo. The most valuable of these testimonies, are from the epistles of *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, who was a warm advocate for episcopal preeminence, yet did not presume to determine any question of moment by his own authority, or without the advice and consent of his presbyters, and was accustomed to take the sense of the whole church on subjects of peculiar interest. See *Cyprian*, Ep. v. p. 11. Ep. xiii. p. 23. Ep. xxviii. p. 39. Ep. xxiv. p. 33. Ep. xxvii. p. 37, 38.—To the objection, that *Cyprian* did himself ordain some presbyters and lectors, without the consent of his council and the laity, it is answered, that the persons so advanced were *Confessors*, who, according to usage, were entitled to ordination, without any previous election. *Cyprian*, Ep. xxxiv. p. 46, 47. Ep. xxxv. p. 48, 49. *Tertulian* de Anima, c. 55. p. 353 &c.—See *Mosheim*, *Commentt. de Reb. Christ.* &c. p. 575—579. *Tr.*]

§ 2. As to the bishop of Rome in particular, he was regarded by *Cyprian*,⁽²⁾ and doubtless by others likewise, as holding something of *primacy* in the church. But the fathers who with *Cyprian* attributed this primacy to the Roman bishop, strenuously contended for the equality of all bishops, in respect to dignity and authority; and disregarding the judgment of the bishop of Rome, whenever it appeared to them incorrect, had no hesitation in following their own judgment. Of this *Cyprian* himself gave a striking example, in his famous controversy with *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, concerning the *baptism of heretics*. Whoever duly considers and compares all their declarations, will readily perceive that this *primacy* was not a primacy of *power* and authority, but only of precedence among associated brethren. That is, the primacy of the Romish bishop in regard to the whole church, was the same as that of *Cyprian* in the African church, which did not impair at all the equality of the African bishops, or curtail their liberties and rights, but merely conferred the right of convoking councils, of presiding in them, and admonishing his brethren fraternally, and the like.⁽³⁾

§ 3. Although the ancient mode of church government seemed in general to remain unaltered, yet there was a gradual deflection from its rules, and an approximation towards the form of a monarchy. For the bishops claimed much higher authority and power than before, and encroached more and more upon the rights not only of the brotherhood but also of the presbyters. And to give plausibility to these usurpations, they advanced new doctrines concerning the church and the episcopal office; which however were so obscure for the most part, that it would seem they did not themselves understand them. The principal author

(2) *Cyprian*, Ep. lxxiii. p. 131. Ep. lv. p. 86. de Unitate ecclesiae, p. 195. ed. Baluze.

(3) See *Stephan Baluze*, Annot. ad Cypriani Epistt. p. 367, 389, 400 &c. And especially *Cyprian* himself, who contends strenuously for the perfect equality of all bishops. Ep. lxxi. p. 127. Nam nec Petrus—vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit se *primatum tenere*, et obtinere a novellis et posteris sibi oportere.—Ep. lxxiii. p. 137. Unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem.—Ep. lv. ad Cornelium Rom. p. 86. Cum statutum—et equum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus.—[and *Cyprian's* address at the opening of the council of Carthage AD 255, in his Works, p. 329. ed. Baluze. Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat *omnis Episcopus* pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui *unus et solus* habet potestatem et praeponendi nos in ecclesiae suae gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi.—The passages referred to in the preceding note, in which *Cyprian* not very intelligibly speaks of a unity in the church and of a certain *primacy* of the Roman pontiff, must be so understood as not to contradict these very explicit assertions of the absolute equality of all bishops.—See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 579—587. Tr.]

of these innovations was *Cyprian*, the most bold and strenuous defender of episcopal power that had then arisen in the church. Yet he was not uniform and consistent, for in times of difficulty, when urged by necessity, he could give up his pretensions, and submit every thing to the judgment and authority of the church.(4)

§ 4. This change in the form of ecclesiastical government was followed by a corrupt state of the clergy. For although examples of primitive piety and virtue were not wanting, yet many were addicted to dissipation, arrogance, voluptuousness, contention, and other vices. This appears indubitable, if we listen to the frequent complaints of the most credible persons of those times.(5) Many bishops now affected the state of princes, and especially those who had charge of the more populous and wealthy congregations; for they sat on thrones, surrounded by their ministers, and other ensigns of their ghostly power, and perhaps also dazzled the eyes and the minds of the populace with their splendid attire. The *presbyters* imitated the example of their superiors, and neglecting the duties of their office, lived in indolence and pleasure. And this emboldened the *deacons* to make encroachments upon the office and the prerogatives of the presbyters.

§ 5. And from this cause especially, in my opinion, the *minor orders* of clergy were every where, in this century, added to the bishops, presbyters and deacons. The words *subdeacons*, *acolythi*, *ostiarii*, or door-keepers, *lectors*, or readers, *exorcists*, and *copiatae*, designate officers, which I think the church would have never had, if the rulers of it had possessed more piety or true religion. But when the honors and privileges of the bishops and presbyters were augmented, the *deacons* also became more infla-

(4) [No man can speak in higher terms of the power of bishops, than the arrogant *Cyprian*—that very *Cyprian*, who when not fired by any passion, is so condescending towards presbyters, deacons, and the common people. He inculcates, on all occasions, that bishops derive their office, not so much from their election by the clergy and people, as from the attestation and decree of God. See Ep. lii. p. 68, 69. Ep. xlv. p. 59. Ep. lv. p. 82. Ep. lxv. p. 113. Ep. lxix. p. 121. He regards bishops as the *successors of the apostles*. Ep. xlii. p. 57. So that bishops are amenable to none, but to God only; while presbyters are amenable to the religious society. Ep. xi. p. 19.—Deacons were created by the bishop; and therefore can be punished by him alone, without the voice of the society. Ep. lxv. p. 114.—Bishops have the same rights with apostles, whose successors they are. And hence, none but God can take cognizance of their actions. Ep. lxix. p. 121.—The whole church is founded on the bishop; and no one is a true member of the church, who is not submissive to his bishop. Ep. lxix. p. 123.—Bishops represent *Christ* himself, and govern and judge in his name. Ep. lv. ad Cornel. p. 81, 82.—Hence all bishops, in the following ages, styled themselves *Vicars of Christ*. See *J. Bingham's Orig. Eccles.* vol. i. p. 81 &c. In the ninth century, a bishop of Paris is so styled in a letter of *Servatus Lupus*. Ep. xcix. p. 149. ed. Baluze. After the ninth century, the bishops of Rome assumed the exclusive right to this as well as other honorary episcopal titles. *Schl. from Mosheim, de Rebus Christianor.* p. 588 &c.]

(5) *Origen*, Comment. in Matthaeum P. i. Opp. p. 420, 441, 442. *Eusebius Historia Eccles.* Lib. viii. cap. 1. p. 291. *Cyprian*, in many of his Epistles.

ted, and refused to perform those meaner offices to which they once cheerfully submitted. The offices designated by these new titles, are in great measure explained by the words themselves. The *exorcists* owed their origin to the doctrine of the New Platonists, adopted by the christians, that evil spirits have a strong desire after the human body, and that vicious men are not so much impelled to sin by their natural depravity, and the influence of bad examples, as by the suggestions of some evil spirit lodging within them.(6) The *copiatae* were employed in the burial of the dead.

§ 6. Marriage was allowed to all the clergy, from the highest rank to the lowest. Yet those were accounted more holy and excellent, who lived in celibacy. For it was the general persuasion, that those who lived in wedlock were much more exposed to the assaults of evil spirits than others:(7) and it was of immense importance, that no impure or malignant spirit should assail the mind or the body of one who was to instruct and govern others. Such persons therefore wished, if possible, to have nothing to do with conjugal life. And this many of the clergy, especially in Africa, endeavored to accomplish with the least violence to their inclinations; for they received into their house and even to their beds, some one of those holy females who had vowed perpetual chastity, affirming however, most religiously, that they had no disgraceful intercourse with these holy sisters.(8) These

(6) See *J. Godofredus*, ad Codicem Theodosianum, tom. vi. p. 48. [Several of the Catholic writers, as e. g. *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Schelstrate*, believed these minor orders of the clergy were instituted by the apostles. But the most learned writers of the Romish communion, and all the Protestants, maintain that they were first instituted in the *third* century. See cardinal *Bona*, *Rerum Liturgicar.* L. i. c. 25. § 16, 17. *Morin*, de Ordinatione, P. iii. Exerc. 14. c. 1. and *Bingham's* *Orig. Eccles.* vol. i. Not one of these orders is even named by any writer who lived before *Tertullian*; nor are all of them named by him. *Cyprian*, in the middle of the *third* century, mentions hypodiaconi, acolythi, and lectores. See his *Epp.* 14, 24, 36, 42, 49, 79. ed. Baluz. And *Cornelius*, bp. of Rome, contemporary with *Cyprian*, in an epistle which is preserved by *Eusebius*. H. E. vi. c. 43. represents his church as embracing 46 (πρεσβυτέρως) presbyters; 7 (διακόνως) deacons; 7 (υποδιακόνως) subdeacons; 42 (ακολύθως) acolythi; and exorcists (ἐξορκιστας), and readers (ἀναγνώστας), with doorkeepers (φυλακῶν), together 52.—The particular functions of these inferior orders are but imperfectly defined by the writers of the third century. From the epistles of *Cyprian* above cited, it appears that subdeacons and acolythi, singly or together, were frequently the bearers of public letters to and from bishops; and that readers were employed to read the scriptural lessons, in time of public worship. The writers and councils of the *fourth* century describe more fully the duties of all these petty officers. Tr.]

(7) *Porphyrius*, περὶ ἀποχῆς, Lib. iv. p. 417.

(8) See *H. Dodwell*, Diss. tertia Cyprianica; and *Lud. Ant. Muratorius*, Diss. de Synisactis et Agapetis, in his *Anecdota Graeca.* p. 218. *Steph. Baluze*, ad *Cypriani Epistol.* p. 5, 12. and others.—[This shameful practice commenced anterior to this century. Slight allusions to it are found in the Shepherd of *Hermas* and in *Tertullian*: but the first distinct mention of it is in *Cyprian*, who inveighs severely against it in some of his epistles.—It is to be remembered, that none but virgin sisters in the church, and they under a vow of perpetual chastity,

concubines were by the Greeks called *συνεῖς*, and by the Latins *mulieres subintroductae*. Many of the bishops indeed sternly opposed this shameful practice ; but it was a long time before it was wholly abolished.

§ 7. Of the writers of this century the most distinguished for the celebrity of his name and for the extent of his writings, was *Origen*, a presbyter and catechist of Alexandria, a man truly great, and a luminary to the christian world. Had his discernment and the soundness of his judgment been equal to his genius, his piety, his industry, his erudition, and his other accomplishments, he would deserve almost unbounded commendation. As he is, all should revere his virtues and his merits.(9)—The second

became *συνεῖς*. With these some of the single clergy attempted to live, in the manner in which certain married people then lived,—dwelling and even sleeping together, but with a mutual agreement to have no conjugal intercourse. Such connections they considered as a marriage of souls, without the marriage of bodies. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christianor. &c. p. 599 &c. Tr.]

(9) See *P. D. Huet*, *Origeniana*, a learned and valuable work ; *Lud. Doucin*, *Histoire d'Origene et des movemens arrivées dans l'église au sujet de sa doctrine*. Paris 1700. 8vo. and *Bayle*, *Dictionaire*, tom. iii. art. *Origene* ; and many others.—[*Origen*, surnamed *Adamantius*, was an Alexandrian Greek, born of christian parents AD. 185. His father *Leonides* was a man of letters, a devout christian, and took great pains with the education of his son, especially in the holy scriptures, some portion of which he required him daily to commit to memory. His education, begun under his father, was completed under *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and the philosopher *Ammonius Saccas*. *Origen* was distinguished for precocity of genius, early piety, and indefatigable industry. When his father suffered martyrdom AD. 202, *Origen*, then 17 years old, was eager to suffer with him, but was prevented by his mother. He wrote to his father in prison, exhorting him to steadfastness in the faith, and to be unsollicitous about his family. The whole property of the family was confiscated, and *Origen*, with his widowed mother and six younger sons were left in poverty. But the persecution having exterminated or driven away all the christian schoolmasters, *Origen* found no difficulty in procuring a school, for which his talents so well qualified him. The next year, AD. 203, *Demetrius*, bp of Alexandria, advanced him to the mastership of the catechetical school, though he was then but 18 years old. His talents as an instructor, his eminent piety, and his assiduous attention to those who suffered in the persecution, procured him high reputation and numerous friends among the christians ; but his great success in making converts to christianity and forming his pupils to be intelligent and devoted christians, rendered him odious to the pagans, who watched about his house and hunted him through the city, in order to assassinate him. The austerity of his life was great. He fed on the coarsest fare, went barefoot, and slept on the ground. He spent the whole day in teaching and in active duties, and devoted most of the night to his private studies and to devotion. About this time he sold his large and valuable collection of pagan authors, for a perpetual income of four *oboli* (about seven cents) per diem, which he regarded as a competent support. Construing the passage in *Matth. xix. 12*. literally, he emasculated himself, in order to avoid temptation in his intercourse with his female pupils. About the year 212, he made a short visit to Rome. On his return he took his former pupil *Heraclas* to be his assistant in the school, so that he might devote more time to theology and the exposition of the scriptures. Many learned persons, pagans and heretics, were converted by him ; and among them, *Ambrose*, a Valentinian and a man of wealth, who became a liberal patron of *Origen*, and at last died a martyr. In the year 215, the persecution under *Caracalla* obliged *Origen* to flee from Alexandria. He retired to *Cæsarea* in Palestine, where he was received with high respect ; and though not even a deacon at that time, the bishops of *Cæsarea* and *Jerusalem* allowed him to expound the scriptures publicly in their presence. The next year,

was *Julius Africanus*, a very learned man, most of whose labors

Demetrius called him back to Alexandria and to his mastership of the catechetical school. About this time an Arabian prince invited him to his court, to impart to him christian instruction. Afterwards, *Mammaea* the mother of the emperor *Alexander Severus*, sent for him to Antioch, in order to hear him preach. In the year 228, he was publicly called to Achaia, to withstand the heretics who disturbed the churches there. On his return through Palestine, *Theoctistus* bp. of Caesarea and *Alexander* bp. of Jerusalem, who had before treated him with marked attention, ordained him a presbyter, to the great offence of *Demetrius*, who was envious of the growing reputation of his catechist. *Demetrius* had little to object against *Origen*, except that he was a eunuch, and that foreign bishops had no right to ordain his laymen. Controversy ensued, and in the year 230, *Demetrius* assembled two councils against him, the first of which banished *Origen* from Alexandria, and the second deprived him of his clerical office. *Demetrius* also wrote letters to Rome and elsewhere, to excite odium against this unoffending man. *Heraclas* now succeeded him in the school at Alexandria, and *Origen* retired AD. 231, to Caesarea in Palestine. Here he resumed his office of instructor, and continued to write expositions of the bible. But in the year 235, a persecution in Palestine obliged him to flee to Caesarea in Cappadocia, where he lived concealed for two years. After his return to Palestine, he visited Athens; and about the year 244, was called to attend a council at Bostra in Arabia, against *Beryllus* bp. of that place, who was heretical in respect to the personal existence of *Christ* previous to his incarnation. *Origen* converted him to the orthodox faith. *Demetrius* his persecutor died AD. 232, and was succeeded by *Heraclas*, a disciple of *Origen*, after whom *Dionysius* the Great filled the see of Alexandria from AD. 248, to 265. The persecution of *Origen* died with his personal enemy *Demetrius*, and he was greatly beloved and honored by all around him till the day of his death. His residence was now fixed at Caesarea in Palestine; but he occasionally visited other places. His time was occupied in an extensive correspondence, in preaching, and in composing books explanatory of the bible, and in defence of christianity. Against the more learned pagans and the heretics of those times, he was a champion that had no equal; he was also considered as a devout and exemplary christian, and was, beyond question, the first biblical scholar of the age. He was master of the literature and the science of that age, which he valued only as subservient to the cause of *Christ*; but he was more skilful in employing them against pagans and heretics, than in the explanation and confirmation of the truths of revelation. In the latter part of his life, during the Decian persecution AD. 250, he was imprisoned for a considerable time, and came near to martyrdom, which he showed himself willing to meet. He was however released, but his sufferings in prison, added to his intense literary labors, had broken down his constitution, and he died AD. 254, at Tyre, in the 69th year of his age.—His winning eloquence, his great learning, his amiable temper, and his reputation for sincere and ardent piety, gave him immense influence, especially among the well informed and the higher classes in society. No man, since the apostles, had been more indefatigable, and no one had done more to diffuse knowledge and make the christian community intelligent, united, and respectable in the view of mankind. He was in general orthodox, according to the standard of that age; but, unfettered in his speculations and unguarded in his communications, he threw out some crude opinions, which the next age gathered up and blazoned abroad, and for which he was accounted by some a heretic. The principal errors ascribed to him, are derived from his four Books *περί ἀρχῶν* (*de principiis*, on the first principles of human knowledge,) and are (1) the pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in material bodies, for offences committed in a former state of being: (2) the pre-existence of *Christ's* human soul, and its union with the divine nature anterior to the incarnation of *Christ*: (3) the transformation of our material bodies into ethereal ones, at the resurrection: (4) the final recovery of all men and even devils, through the mediation of *Christ*.—*Origen* could number among his pupils many eminent martyrs and divines, among whom *Firmilianus* of Cappadocia, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and *Dionysius* the Great, bp. of Alexandria, are best known at the present day.—His life and history are best related by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. passim; and by

and works are lost.(10) The name of *Hippolytus* ranks very

Jerome, de Viris Illustr. cap. 55, and Ep. 41 or 65. The united work of *Pamphilus* and *Eusebius*, in defence of *Origen*, in six Books, is unfortunately lost, except the first Book, of which we have a translation by *Ruffinus*. *Epiphanius*, Hæres. 64, gives a philippic upon *Origen* and his followers. *Photius*, Biblioth. cxviii. affords us some knowledge of his lost works.—*Origen* was a most voluminous writer. *Eusebius* says he collected 100 Epistles of *Origen*; and that when 60 years old, *Origen* permitted stenographers to write down his extempore discourses.—Besides these he composed eight Books against *Celsus*, in defence of christianity, which are still extant; four Books *περί ἀρχῶν*, extant in a Latin translation by *Ruffinus*: ten Books entitled *Stromata*, which are lost: his *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, of which little remains; and tracts on prayer, martyrdom, and the Resurrection. But his principal works are expositions of the scriptures. It is said he wrote on every book in the bible, except the Apocalypse. His allegorical mode of interpreting scripture is described by *Mosheim* in the next chapter. *Origen's* expositions are of three kinds; (1) Homilies, or popular lectures; (2) Commentaries, divided into books, which are full, elaborate and learned expositions; (3) Scholia, or short notes, intended especially for the learned. A collection of *Origen's* Scholia, and scattered remarks on scripture, compiled by *Basil* the Great and *Gregory Nazianzen*, is extant, bearing the title of *φιλοκαλία*. A large part of his Homilies and Commentaries are wholly lost, and some of the others have come to us only in the Latin translation of *Ruffinus*.—The earlier editions of *Origen's* works are chiefly in Latin, and of little value. *P. D. Huet*, a Benedictine monk, first published, AD. 1668, in 2 vol. Fol. the expository works of *Origen*, Greek and Latin, with notes, and a valuable introduction entitled *Origeniana*. *Bern. de Montfaucon*, another Benedictine, collected and published what remains of his *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, Paris 1714, 2 vol. Fol. But the best edition of all his works, except the *Hexapla*, is that of the Benedictines *Charles*, and *Charles Vincent, de la Rue*, Paris 1733—59, 4 vol. Fol.—The text of this edition, Gr. and Lat. without the notes and dissertations, was republished by *Oberthür*, Würzburg, 1780—93, 15 vol. 8vo.—The principal modern writers concerning *Origen*, besides *Huet* and the *de la Rues*, are *Tillemont*, Mem.—à l'Hist. de l'Eglise, tom. iii. p. 216—264. *Bayle*, Dict. art. Origene; *Cave*, Hist. Lit. vol. i. p. 112 &c. *Lardner*, Credibility, P. ii. vol. ii. p. 161 &c. *Haloix*, Defence of *Origen*; *Doucin*, Histoire d'Origene, Paris 1700, 8vo. *Mosheim*, de Rob. Christ. p. 605—640; *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. Vol. iv. p. 29—145. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. Vol. I. p. 1172—1214. *Milner's* account of *Origen*, Eccl. Hist. Cent. iii. ch. 5, 6, 15, is not impartial. Tr.]

(10) *Julius Africanus*, for erudition, and as an interpreter of scripture, is ranked with *Clemens Alex.* and *Origen*, by *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 35. The best account of this distinguished man, is derived from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. vi. c. 31. and *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 63. He was probably of Nicopolis, once called Emmaus, in Judea, and is supposed to have died, being a man in years, about AD. 232.—Of his life little is known, except that he once visited Alexandria, to confer with *Heraclas*, head of the catechetical school after *Origen*; and that, the city of Nicopolis having been burnt, about AD. 221, *Africanus* was sent as envoy to the emperor, with a petition that it might be rebuilt.—His principal work was Annals of the world, from the creation down to AD. 221, in five Books. This work, of which only fragments now remain, was highly esteemed by the ancients, and was the basis of many similar works, namely, the *Chronicons* of *Eusebius*, *Syncellus*, *Malala*, *Theophanes*, *Cedrenus*, and others. He was author of a letter to *Aristides*, reconciling the two genealogies of our Savior. Of this work we have a long extract in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. i. 7. and a fragment in *Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. ii. p. 115. *Africanus* supposed *Matthew* to give the true descent of *Joseph* from *David* by *Solomon*, and *Luke* to give his legal descent from the same by *Nathan*, according to the law for raising up seed to a deceased brother. *Jacob* and *Heli*, the two reputed fathers of *Joseph*, he supposed, were half-brothers, having the same mother, but different fathers; and *Heli* dying childless, *Jacob* married his widow and begat *Joseph*, whom the law accounted as the son of the deceased *Heli*.—Another letter of *Africanus*, addressed to *Origen*, is still extant in the works of *Origen*, vol. i. p. 10—12. ed. de la Rue. The

high among both the writers and the martyrs; but his history is involved in much obscurity.(11) The writings now extant bearing the name of this great man, are not without reason regarded by many as being either spurious or at least corrupted. *Gregory*, bishop of New Caesarea [in Pontus,] was surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, on account of the numerous and distinguished miracles which he is said to have wrought. But few of his writings are now extant; his miracles are questioned by many at the present day.(12) I could wish that many writings of *Dionysius*, bishop

object of this letter is, to prove the history of Susanna spurious, and the work of some person much younger than *Daniel*. His chief argument is, that the writer makes Daniel play upon the Greek words, *σχῆνος* and *πρίνος*, in verses 54, 55, 58, 59, while examining the witnesses against Susanna — *Eusebius* and others ascribe to *Africanus* another and larger work, entitled *Κεσόι*. It is a miscellany, and unworthy of a christian divine. *Valesius* thinks *Eusebius* mistook, attributing the work of some pagan bearing the same name, to this christian father. Others suppose it might have been written by *Africanus*, in his youth or before his conversion. Many fragments of it have been collected by *Thevenot*, and published in his Collection of the writings of the ancient Greek mathematicians, Paris 1693. Fol. Tr.]

(11) The Benedictine monks have, with great labor and erudition, endeavored to dispel this darkness. See *Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. i. p. 361 &c. Paris 1733. 4to.—[Both *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. c. 20, 22. and *Jerome de Viris Illustr.* c. 61. make him to have flourished in the reign of *Severus*, AD. 222 &c. and to have been a bishop, but of what city they could not learn. Subsequent writers were divided, some representing him as an Arabian bishop, and others as bishop of Ostia near Rome, whence he is surnamed *Portuensis*. Perhaps he spent part of his life in the East, and part in the West. That he was a martyr, is generally conceded: though the poem of *Prudentius* on the martyrdom of *Hippolytus*, refers to another person, who was a Roman presbyter.—*Eusebius*, l. c. gives this account of his writings: "Besides many other works, he wrote a treatise concerning Easter, in which he describes the succession of events, and proposes a Paschal Cycle of 16 years; the work terminates with the first year of the emperor Alexander." (*Severus*, AD. 222.) "His other writings which have reached me, are these: on the Hexameron" (*Gen. ch. i.*); "on what follows the Hexameron; against *Marcion*; on the Canticles; on parts of Ezekiel; concerning Easter; against all the heresies." Besides these, *Jerome* mentions his Commentaries on Exodus, Zechariah, the Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes; and tracts concerning *Saul* and the witch, Antichrist, the resurrection; his discourse in praise of our Lord and Savior. Some other works of *Hippolytus* are enumerated in an inscription on the base of his statue, dug up near Rome in the year 1551; also by *Photius*, *Biblioth.* No. 121 and 122; and *Ebedjesus*, in *Assemani Biblioth. Orient.* tom. iii. Pt. i. His Paschal Cycle is his only work that has come down to us entire. The dialogue concerning *Christ* and Antichrist, still extant, if really his, does him little credit as a theologian. The concluding part of his work against all the heresies, still remains, and gives us the best account we have, though a lame one, of the heresy of *Noetus*.—All that remains of him, genuine and adulterated, and all that is ascribed to him, are well edited by *Fabricius*, in two thin volumes Fol. Hamb. 1716—18.—For a more full account of him and his writings, besides the *Histoire Litt. de la France*, and *Fabricius*, ad *Hippol. Opera*, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires a l'Hist. Eccles.* tom. iii. p. 104, and 309 &c. *Care*, *Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 102 &c. *Lardner*, *Credib.* Pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 69 &c. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. iv. p. 154 &c. *Neander*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 1147 &c. Tr.]

(12) See *Anton. van Dale*, Preface to his book de *Oraculis*, p. 6. [*Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. p. 351 &c. and p. 380—392, and *Lardner*, *Credibility*, Pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 450 &c.—*Gregory* of New Caesarea in Pontus, whose original name was *Theodorus*, was born of heathen parents at New Casarea near the beginning of this century. His family was wealthy and respectable. After the

of Alexandria, were now extant; for the few fragments which have reached us, show that he was a man of distinguished wisdom and mildness of disposition, and prove that the ancients used no flattery when they styled him *Dionysius the Great*.(13) *Me-*

death of his father, which was when he was fourteen years old, his mother and the children became nominally christians. But Gregory was a stranger to the bible, and ambitious to make a figure in the world. About the year 231, he left Pontus, intending to study law in the famous law school at Berytus, but meeting with *Origen* at Caesarea, he was induced to change his purpose. He applied himself to the study of the bible, was baptized, assumed the name of *Gregory*, and continued under the instruction of *Origen* eight years, except that he fled to Alexandria for a short time to avoid persecution. He was now a devoted christian, and a man of great promise. On leaving *Origen*, he composed and read in a public assembly an eulogy on his instructor, in which he gives account of his own past life, and of the manner in which *Origen* had allured him to the study of the scriptures, and changed all his views. Taking an affectionate leave of his master, he returned to Pontus, and became bishop of his native city, New Caesarea, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was a laborious and successful pastor, and highly respected for his talents and piety, as well as for numerous miracles which he is said to have wrought. When created bishop, he found but seventeen christians in his very populous diocese. When he died, there was only about the same number of pagans in it. He and his flock endured persecution in the year 250. He attended the first council of Antioch, against *Paul* of Samosate in the year 264 or 265, and died soon after.—Some account of him is given by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. vi. 30. and vii. 14, 28. *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 65, and Ep. ad Magnum. But his great eulogists among the ancients, were the two brothers *Basil* the Great, and *Gregory* Nyssen, whose grandmother sat under the ministry of *Greg. Thaum.* and furnished her grand children with an account of him. *Basil* speaks of him in his book on the Holy Spirit, and in his Epistles, No. 28, 110, 204, 207, or 62, 64, 75, 63; and *Nyssen*, in his life of *Gregory Thaum.* inter. Opp. *Greg. Nys.* tom. iii. p. 536, &c. Among the moderns who give us his history, and enumerate his works, see *Tillemont*, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccl. tom. iv. p. 131 &c. and Notes sur St. *Greg. Thaum.* p. 47. *Du Pin*, Nov. Biblioth. des Aut. Eccles. tom. i. p. 184 &c. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. v. p. 247 &c. *Care*, Hist. Lit. vol. i. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. p. 12–24 &c. *Schroeckh*, ubi supra. *Lard.* ubi supra. and *Milner*, Eccles. Hist. Cent. iii. ch. 18.—The only genuine works of *Gregory*, that are extant, are his *Eulogy on Origen*, which has been mentioned; a *Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*; a short *Confession of faith*, (the last part of which some have questioned;) and a *Letter*, containing counsel for the treatment of the lapsed.—The spurious works attributed to him, are, *Capita xii. de Fide*, with anathemas;—in *Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ—Mariæ Sermones tres*; in *Sancta Theophania*, sive de apparitione Dei, et Christi Baptismo, *Sermo*; *de Anima* disputatio ad *Tatianum*; *Expositio Fidei*, ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίσις, (relating only to the Trinity.)—All these were collected and published, with learned notes, by *Gerard Vossius*, Mayence, 1604, 4to. and Paris, 1622, Fol. with the works of *Macarius*, *Basil* of Seleucia, and a tract of *Zonaras*, subjoined. *Tr.*]

(13) The history of *Dionysius* is carefully written by *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, tome i. Livr. ii. cap. 5. p. 68.—[He was probably born of heathen parents, but early converted to the christian faith by *Origen*, under whom he had his education at Alexandria. He became a presbyter there; and succeeded *Heraclas*, as head of the catechetical school, about the year 232, and on the death of *Heraclas*, AD. 248, he again succeeded him in the episcopal chair, which he filled till his death in the year 265. We know little of his history, while a catechist, except that he now read carefully all the works of heretics and pagans, and made himself master of the controversies of the day. (*Euseb.* H. E. Lib. vii. c. 7.) As a bishop he was uncommonly laborious and faithful. He lived in stormy times, was called to almost continual contests with errorists, and had little rest from persecution, in which he and his flock suffered exceedingly. These sufferings are described in the copious extracts from his writings, preserved by *Eusebius*, in his Eccles. History, Book vi. and vii. In the year 249, the pagans of

Dionysius was a man of piety, and had some weight of character ;

Alexandria made insurrection against the christians, murdered several, assaulted and plundered and drove into hiding places most of the rest. The next year the general persecution under *Decius* commenced, and *Dionysius* was under arrest, and suffered much, with his flock, for a year and a half. Soon after his release, the pestilence began to lay waste the church and the city, and did not entirely cease till the end of twelve years. About the same time, *Nepos*, an Egyptian bishop, embraced and disseminated millenarian principles ; but was at length reclaimed by *Dionysius*. The warm contest respecting the rebaptism of converted heretics, about the year 256, was submitted by both parties to him, and drew forth several able productions from his pen. Not long after he had to withstand the Sabellians in a long and arduous controversy. In the year 257, the persecution under *Valerian* commenced ; and for about two years, *Dionysius* was in banishment, transported from place to place, and subjected to great sufferings. After his return, in the year 260, insurrection among the pagans, and civil war and famine raged at Alexandria. Scarcely was quiet restored, when this aged and faithful servant of God was solicited to aid in the controversy against *Paul* of Samosata. His infirmities prevented his attending the council of Antioch in 265, where *Paul* was condemned ; but he wrote his judgment of the controversy, sent it to the council, and died soon after in the close of that year.—In his controversy with the Sabellians, he was—to say the least—unfortunate. For in his zeal to maintain a *personal distinction* between the Father and the Son, he let drop expressions which seemed to imply, that the latter was of another and an inferior nature to the former. This led the Sabellians to accuse him of heresy ; and a council assembled at Rome, called on him to explain his views. He replied in several books or letters, addressed to *Dionysius* bishop of Rome, which pretty well satisfied his contemporaries. Afterwards, when the Arians claimed him, *Athanasius* came forth in vindication of his orthodoxy. Dr. Mosheim (de Rebus Christianor. p. 696 &c.) supposes that *Dionysius* differed from the orthodox on the one hand, and from Sabellius on the other, in the following manner. They all agreed, that in Jesus Christ, *two natures*, the human and the divine, were united. The orthodox maintained, that *both* natures constituted but *one person*, and denied personality to the human nature. *Sabellius* admitted the union of two natures in Christ, but denied personality to his *divine* nature. *Dionysius* distinguished *two persons*, as well as two natures in Christ ; and affirmed that the actions and sufferings of the human nature could not be predicated of the divine nature.—*Natalis Alexander* has a Dissertation (Hist. Eccles. saecul. iii. Diss. xix.) in vindication of the orthodoxy, though not of all the phraseology of *Dionysius*.—For a knowledge of the life and writings of *Dionysius*, the chief original sources are *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vi. c. 29, 35, 40—42, 44—46. L. vii. c. 1, 4—11, 20—28. *Praepar. Evang.* L. xiv. c. 23—27. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 69. and Prefatio ad Lib. 18. Comment. in Esaiam ; *Athanasius*, de Sententia Dionysii ; and de Synodi Nicaenae Decretis ; *Basil*, de Spiritu Sancto c. 29. Epist. ad Amphilocho. and Epist. ad Maximum.—Of his works, only two short compositions have come to us entire ; namely his very sensible letter to *Novatian*, (apud *Eusebii* Hist. Eccles. vi. 45.) and his Epistola Canonica ad *Basilidem*, in which he gives his opinion respecting the proper hour for terminating the fast before Easter, and the obligation of christians to observe certain Jewish laws respecting personal uncleannesses. But we have valuable extracts from many of his letters and books. *Eusebius* gives portions of the following ; namely, his Epistle to *Germanus*, giving account of his flight and sufferings in the Decian persecution. (H. E. vi. 40. and vii. 11.)—Ep. to *Fabius* bishop of Antioch, describing the sufferings of his flock in the same persecution, (H. E. vi. 40—42, 44,) Ep. to *Hermammon*, on the character of the emperors *Decius* and *Valerian*, (H. E. vii. 1, 10, 23.)—Ep. to *Stephen* bishop of Rome, on the peace after the persecution of *Gallus* (H. E. vii. 4, 5.)—Ep. to *Domitius* and *Didymus*, describing the Decian persecution at Alexandria (H. E. vii. 11.)—Ep. to *Hierax*, describing the sedition at Alexandria, (H. E. vii. 21.)—Ep. to *Sixtus* bishop of Rome, on rebaptism of heretics, and on the Sabellians, (H. E. vii. 5, 6.)—Another Ep. to the same, on rebaptism &c (H. E. vii. 9.)—Ep. to *Philemon*, a Roman presbyter, on the same subject, (H. E. vii. 7.)—Ep. to *Dionysius*, then a presbyter at Rome, on the same subject, and concerning *Novatian*, (H. E. vii. 7, 8.)—Two Books

but the few works of his remaining, prove him not to be a man of an accurate and discriminating mind.(14)

§ 8. Of the Latin writers of this century, *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, deservedly stands first. The epistles and tracts of this distinguished and eloquent man, breathe such a spirit of ardent piety, that almost no one can read them without feeling his soul stirred within him. Yet *Cyprian* would doubtless have been a better writer, if he had been less studious of rhetorical ornaments, and a better bishop, if he had been more capable of controlling his temper and of discriminating between truth and error.(15)

against *Nepos* and the Millenarians, on the promises to the saints in the Apocalypse, the nature of that book, and its author, (H. E. vii. 24, 25.)—Ep. to his own flock, after the plague, consolatory, (H. E. vii. 22.)—Libri iv. de Natura, against Epicurean doctrines, dedicated to his son, (*Euseb. Praep. Evang.* xiv. 23—27.)—*Athanasius* also gives extracts from various of his works.—*Eusebius* mentions several works of *Dionysius*, from which he gives no extracts. (H. E. vi. 46. and vii. 26.) namely, Epistles to the brethren in Egypt, de Poenitentia—to *Cornelius* bishop of Rome, de Poenitentia—to his own church, a monitory epistle—to *Origen*, on Martyrdom—to the brethren of *Laodicea*—to the brethren in *Armenia*—to *Cornelius* bishop of Rome, concerning *Novatian*—to the brethren at Rome, three epistles concerning the office of a deacon, concerning peace, and de Poenitentia—to the confessors at Rome, who favored *Novatian*—to the same, after they returned to the church, two letters—to *Sixtus* and the church at Rome, on rebaptism, &c.—to *Dionysius of Rome*, concerning *Lucian*—and various *Paschal Epistles*, (a species of pastoral letters,) addressed to *Flavius*—to *Domitian* and *Didymus*—to his own presbyters—to his flock, after the persecution of *Valerian*—to the brethren in Egypt, &c.

(14) [*Methodius*, Patarensis, Eubulius, was bp. of Olympus or of Patara, in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre. He lived during the last half of the third century; and died a martyr, at Chalcis in Greece, probably AD. 311, during the Diocletian persecution. *Jerome* (de Viris Illustr. c. 83,) ranks him among the popular writers, and commends him especially for the neatness of his style: but *Socrates* (in his Hist. Eccles. L. vi. c. 13,) represents him as one of those low and contemptible scribblers, who endeavor to bring themselves into notice by assailing the characters of their superiors. His works, as enumerated by *Jerome*, are (1) Two Books against *Porphyry*, (a large work, now lost,)—(2) Feast of the ten Virgins, (a Dialogue of pious females, in praise of celibacy. It is still extant, though perhaps corrupted; but does its author little credit)—(3) On the resurrection of the body, against *Origen*, opus egregium. (It is but an indifferent work; much of it is preserved by *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxiv. *Photius*, Biblioth. ccxxiv. &c.)—(4) On the witch of Endor, against *Origen*; (not extant;)—(5) On free will (and the origin of evil; not from matter, but from abuse of human liberty. Extracts from it remain.)—(6) Commentaries on Genesis and Canticles, (almost wholly lost)—(7) Many other popular works, (not described by *Jerome*.)—The works of *Methodius*, so far as they remain, were edited with those of *Amphilochius* and *Andreas Cretensis*, by *Francis Combefis*, Paris, 1644. Fol. But the Feast of Virgins first appeared in the original Greek, in *Combefis*, Auctar. noviss. Biblioth. P. P. Graec. P. i.—Several discourses of the younger *Methodius*, patriarch of Constantinople in the 9th century, have been ascribed to the senior *Methodius*. Tr.]

(15) [*Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus* was born of heathen parents, and probably about the year 200, at Carthage in Africa. He was rather dissipated, but was a man of genius, and a teacher of rhetoric. In the year 244 or 245 he was converted to christianity, by *Caecilius* a presbyter of Carthage, whose name he assumed. An account of his conversion, we have in his tract, de Gratia Dei, ad Donatum. As soon as he became a christian, he distributed all his property in charity to the poor, devoted himself much to the study of the bible and of his favorite author *Tertullian*, and showed a zeal and earnestness in religion seldom equalled. He was made a presbyter a few months after his conversion, and was

The *Dialogue of Minucius Felix*, which he intitled *Octavius*, answers the arguments, by which the christians were commonly attacked by their adversaries, in a manner so spirited and so handsome, that it cannot be disregarded except by those who are willing to be ignorant of the state of the church in this century. (16)

advanced to the episcopal chair in the year 248. As a bishop he was indefatigable and efficient. Few men ever accomplished so much in a long life, as *Cyprian* did in the ten years of his episcopacy. In the year 250 the Decian persecution obliged him to leave Carthage, and live in concealment for more than a year. During his exile he wrote 39 epistles, which are extant, addressed to his church, to its officers collectively or individually, to other bishops, and to various individuals. On his return to Carthage AD. 251, he had much to do to collect and regulate his flock: a controversy arose respecting the reception of the lapsed to christian fellowship: and *Cyprian* had personal contests with some of his presbyters, who were opposed to him. He was also drawn into the Novation controversy. The persecution was soon after renewed by the emperor *Gallus*; and pestilence and famine spread wide; and incursions of barbarians from the desert laid waste the back country. *Cyprian* wrote and preached incessantly; and in the year 253, called a council and roused up the African churches to great efforts for redeeming christian captives. For several years he was most laboriously employed in preaching, composing tracts, and directing the ecclesiastical affairs, not only of Carthage and Africa, but of other countries. In the year 257, the persecution under *Valerian* broke out, and *Cyprian* was banished to Curubis. The persecution was severe in Africa: many were imprisoned, condemned to the mines, or put to death. *Cyprian* gave what aid he could to his suffering brethren. The next year, AD. 258, he was recalled from banishment, summoned before the new governor, *Maximus*, and condemned to be beheaded.—*Cyprian* lived but 12 years after he embraced christianity, and during 10 of these he was incessantly engaged in active duties. It was impossible therefore, that he should become a very learned theologian. Though a man of genius, he was not a metaphysician or philosopher, and seems not formed for abstruse speculations. He was an orator and a man of business, rather than a profound scholar. The practical part of christianity, and the order and discipline of the church, most engaged his attention. Naturally ardent, and pouring daily over the writings of *Tertullian*, he imbibed very much the spirit and the principles of that gloomy Montanist: and having high ideas of episcopal power, and great intrepidity of character, he was an energetic prelate, and a severe disciplinarian.—The best original sources for the history of this distinguished man, are his own numerous letters and tracts, and the *Passio S. Cypriani*, or account of his martyrdom, written by *Pontius* one of his deacons. He is very honorably mentioned by many of the fathers; and *Gregory Naz.* wrote a professed eulogy of him. The moderns also, especially the catholics and the English Episcopalians, have written elaborately concerning his history, his works, and his opinions. See bp. *Pearson's* *Annales Cyprianici*, and *H. Dodwell's* *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, in the Oxford edition of *Cyprian's* works, 1682; *Tillemont*, *Mémoires—à l'Histoire Eccles.* tom. iv. p. 19 &c. and *Notes sur St. Cyprien* p. 10 &c. *Prud. Maran*, *Vita S. Cypriani*, prefixed to *Opp. Cypr.* ed. Paris 1726, p. 38—134: and *J. Milner's* *Church Hist.* Cent. iii. ch. 7—15.—His works consist of 81 Epistles, and 14 Treatises, which are accounted genuine. They are nearly all practical,—hortatory, controversial, and official or friendly letters.—His style is neither perspicuous nor chaste, but ardent and animated. He and *Lactantius*, it has been said, were the fathers of ecclesiastical Latinity.—The earlier editions of his works by *Erasmus* and others, arranged his letters in Books, without regard to their dates or subjects. The edition of *Pamelius*, 1566, republished by *Rigaltius* 1664, attempted to arrange them in chronological order. The Oxford edition by bp. *Fell*, 1682, Fol. perfected this arrangement. The edition prepared by *Baluze*, and published by *Prudentius Maran*, Paris 1726, Fol. retains the order of *Pamelius*. The two last are the best editions. Tr.]

(16) [*Minucius Felix* was a respectable christian barrister at Rome, and is supposed to have been contemporary with *Tertullian*, and to have flourished about the year 200. He is mentioned by *Jerome*, de *Viris Illustr.* c. 58. and by *Lactan-*

The seven Books of *Arnobius*, the African, *against the Gentiles*, are more full and copious, and though obscure in several places, will not be read without both pleasure and profit. Yet this rhetorician, who was superficial in his knowledge of christian doctrines, has commingled great errors with important truths, and has set forth a strange philosophical kind of religion, very different from that ordinarily received.(17) The writers of less eminence, I leave to be learned from those who have professedly enumerated the learned men among christians.(18)

Arnobius, Institut. Divinar. L. i. c. 11. and L. v. c. 1. Little is known of his history. His elegant Dialogue, between *Caecilius* a pagan and *Octavius* a christian, recounts the principal arguments urged for and against christianity at that time, in a clear, concise, and forceable manner. The Latinity is pure and elegant. *Jerome* informs us that another tract, de Fato vel contra Mathematicos, was ascribed to him; but from its style, it was probably not his. This tract is now lost. In the middle ages, the *Octavius* of *Minucius* was mistaken for the 8th Book (Liber Octavus) of *Arnobius*: and it was so published in the earlier editions. It has been often republished. The best editions, cum notis variorum, are those of *Gronovius*, Leyden, 1709, 8vo.; and of *Davis*, Cambridge, 1707 and 1711. 8vo. The Germans are fond of the edition of *Cellarius*, 1698, 8vo. republished by *Lindner*, 1760, and by *Ernesti* 1773. 8vo.—It has been translated into French, Dutch, and English, the last, by *Reeves*, among his Apologies in defence of the christian religion, vol. ii. Lond. 1709. 8vo. Tr.]

(17) [*Arnobius*, senior, was a teacher of rhetoric at Sicca in Africa, during the reign of *Diocletian*. See *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 79. He was at first an open adversary of the christian religion, but at length being fully convinced of its truth, he undertook to defend it in a learned and elaborate work. But, either his knowledge of christianity was then very limited, or he had studied the scriptures only in private, and without seeking instruction from the christian teachers, for he entertained many singular opinions. *Jerome* reports, (Chron. ad ann. xx. Constantini,) that when *Arnobius* applied to the bishop for baptism, the latter refused him, from doubts of the sincerity of his conversion; and that *Arnobius* wrote his book to satisfy the mind of the bishop. This account is called in question by some. See *Lardner*, Credibility &c. Pt. ii. vol. iv. p. 7. and *Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. p. 1161 &c. He probably wrote in the beginning of the 4th century, and died perhaps about AD. 326.—The best early editions of his work, are those printed at Leyden, 1651 and 1657, 4to. The latest edition is that of *Orell*, Lips. 1816. 8vo. in 2 parts, with an Appendix, 1817. 8vo. Tr.]

(18) [The following notices of other leading men in this century, may be interesting to the literary reader.

Caius, a learned ecclesiastic of Rome, in the beginning of this century, is mentioned by *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 59. and is quoted repeatedly by *Eusebius*. In his work against Proculus the Montanist, he assailed the Chiliasts, and ascribed but 13 epistles to St. Paul. *Euseb.* H. E. ii. 25. iii. 28. and vi. 20. He has been supposed by some, to be the author of the book against *Artemon*, quoted by *Euseb.* H. E. v. 28.

Just before AD. 200, *Theophilus* bp. of Antioch, *Bacchylus* bp. of Caesarea in Palestine, and *Polycrates* bp. of Ephesus, called councils on the controversy respecting Easter day, and composed synodic epistles. See *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 43—45. and *Euseb.* H. E. v. 23, and 25. From the epistle of *Polycrates*, valuable extracts are made by *Jerome*, l. c. and *Euseb.* H. E. iii. 31. and v. 24.

At the commencement of this century, lived *Heracitus*, *Maximus*, *Candidus*, *Appion*, *Sextus*, and *Arabianus*, who were distinguished as writers, according to *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 46—51. and *Euseb.* H. E. v. 27.—*Heracitus* commented on Paul's Epistles; *Maximus* wrote concerning the origin of evil, (περί τῆς ὕλης, from which we have a considerable extract, in *Euseb.* Praepar. Evang. vi. 22;) *Candidus* and *Appion* explained the Hexaëmeron, or six days' work, Gen. ch. i.; *Sextus* wrote on the resurrection; and *Arabianus* composed some doctrinal tracts.

Judas, of the same age, undertook a computation of the 70 weeks of Daniel; and brought down his history of events to AD. 203. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 52. and *Euseb.* H. E. vi. 7.

Ammonius was probably an Egyptian christian, nearly contemporary with *Origen*; and not the apostate philosopher *Ammonius Saccas* under whom *Origen* studied, though confounded with him by *Euseb.* H. E. vi. 19. and by *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 55. See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. iv. p. 161 and 172, and *Mosheim* de Reb. Christianor. p. 281 &c. He wrote a book on the agreement of Moses with Jesus, which is lost, and a Harmony of the four Gospels, which is supposed to be one of those still extant in the Biblioth. Max. Patrum. But whether the larger Harmony, in tom. ii. Pt. ii. or the smaller, in tom. iii. is the genuine work, has been doubted. See *Lardner*, Credibility &c. Pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 106 &c.

Tryphon, a disciple of *Origen*, is said by *Jerome* (de Viris Illustr. c. 57.) to have been very learned in the scriptures, and to have written many epistles and tracts, and particularly a treatise concerning the red heifer, in the book of Num. ch. xix.; and another, on the dividing of the birds, in Abraham's sacrifice, Gen. xv. 10. Nothing of his is extant.

Symmachus, originally a Samaritan, then a Jew, and at last an Ebionite christian, gave a free translation of the O. T. into Greek; and also defended the principles of the Ebionites, in a Commentary on Matthew's Gospel. See *Euseb.* H. E. vi. 17.

Narcissus was made bp. of Jerusalem AD. 196. After four years of faithful service, he was falsely accused of immoral conduct; and, though generally accounted innocent, he voluntarily abdicated his office, and lived in retirement till AD. 216, when he resumed his office and continued in it till his martyrdom, AD. 237. He was then 116 years old. See *Euseb.* H. E. vi. c. 9, 10, 11.

Alexander succeeded *Narcissus*, AD. 237, and held the chair 14 years. This eminent man was bishop of a church in Cappadocia, when called to the see of Jerusalem. He was a great patron of *Origen*; and wrote several epistles, from which extracts are preserved. After important services to the church, he died a martyr, AD. 251. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 62, and *Euseb.* H. E. vi. 11, 14, 19, 26, 39, and 46.

Firmilian, bp. of Caesarea in Cappadocia, was a great admirer and a disciple of *Origen*. He was a man of high eminence in the church, and died at Tarsus, on his way to the second council of Antioch against *Paul* of Samosata, about AD. 266. A long and able epistle of his to *Cyprian*, on the rebaptism of Heretics, is preserved in a Latin translation, among the works of *Cyprian*, Ep. 75. See *Euseb.* H. E. vi. 26, 27, 46, and vii. 5, 29.

Pontius, a deacon of Carthage, attended *Cyprian* at his death, and wrote an account of his martyrdom, which has reached us, though perhaps interpolated. It is prefixed to *Cyprian's* works, and is found in *Ruinart*, Acta Selecta Martyrum. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 68.—*Pontius* himself, it is said, suffered martyrdom shortly after; of which an account is extant, professedly written by his fellow deacon *Valerius*; apud *Baluzii* Miscell. tom. ii. p. 124.

Cornelius, bp. of Rome, was elected June 2, AD. 251, in opposition to *Novatian*; and after 15 months, died in banishment at Centumcellae, (Civita-Vechia,) Sept. 14. AD. 252. In the works of *Cyprian*, there are extant two epistles of *Cornelius* to *Cyprian*, and ten epp. of *Cyprian* to *Cornelius*. *Cyprian* describes him (Ep. 52. ed. Baluz.) as an unimpeachable character, a pious, sensible, modest man, well qualified to be a bishop. *Jerome* (de Viris Illustr. c. 66.) mentions four epistles of *Cornelius* to *Fabius* bp. of Antioch; and *Euseb.* gives us a long and valuable extract from one of them. H. E. vi. 43.—See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, Vol. i.

Novatian, first a presbyter, and then the schismatical bp. of Rome, wrote, (according to *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 70.) de Pascha; de Sabbatho; de Circumcisione; de Sacerdote; de Oratione; de Cibis Judaicis, (extant, inter Opp. *Tertulliani*;) de instantia; de Attalo; de Trinitate, (a large book, being an abridgment of a work of *Tertullian*, extant, inter Opp. *Tertul.*) and many other works. An epistle written by him to *Cyprian*, in the name of the Roman clergy, AD. 250, is likewise extant, (inter Opp. *Cypriani*, Ep. 31. ed. Baluz.) and shows that he was a man of talents, and a good writer. His rival, *Cornelius*, describes him as a very bad man: see *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 43.

Stephen bp. of Rome, AD. 253—257, is chiefly famous for his presumptuous attempt to excommunicate *Cyprian* and many other bishops of Africa and the

East, for rebaptizing converted heretics. See *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 2—5, 7. *Cyprian*, Ep. 70—75. *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, Vol. i.

Sixtus II. bp. of Rome AD. 257—258, and a martyr, was more conciliatory than his predecessor. *Euseb.* vii. 5, 9. *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. i.—Various supposititious writings are extant under his name. The most noted is a series of 460 moral Apothegms, translated by *Ruffinus*. *Jerome* (on Ezek. c. 18. and elsewhere,) and *Augustine* (Retract. L. ii. c. 42,) pronounce them the work of *Sixtus* a pagan philosopher; which they probably are, notwithstanding *U. G. Sieber*, their editor, (Lips. 1725. 4to.) has labored hard to fix them on this Roman bishop.

Dionysius, bp. of Rome AD. 259—269, was a learned man, and a good bishop. See *Basil*, Ep. 220, and de Sp. Sancto c. 29 *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 7. He wrote an ep. against the Sabellians, of which *Athanasius* (de Synodi Nicaenae Decretis) has preserved an extract; also an ep. to *Dionysius* of Alexandria, acquainting him with the dissatisfaction of a council of bishops at Rome, with some expressions concerning the Trinity used by that patriarch, and requesting of him an explanation; which was given in four Letters or Books. *Athanasius*, pro sententia Dionys. Alex. and *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 26.—See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. i.

Malchion, a presbyter and a teacher of philosophy at Antioch. He greatly distinguished himself in the third council, against *Paul* of Samosata, AD. 269. Two previous councils had been unable to convict the crafty heretic; but in this, *Malchion* encountered him in presence of the council, while stenographers took down their dialogue. *Paul* was now convicted; and the Dialogue was published. *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 29. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 71.

Commodianus, a christian poet, was probably an African and contemporary, or nearly so, with *Cyprian*. See *Dodwell's* Diss. de aetate Commodiani. He had a smattering of Greek and Latin learning; but was a weak, though well-meaning man. His book comprises 80 paragraphs, called Instructions. It is written acrostically, and in a loose kind of hexameter. The style is rude, and the matter trite. The first half of the book is directed against the pagans; next he assails the unbelieving Jews; and then attempts to instruct all classes of christians, and all ranks of ecclesiastical functionaries. It was first published by *Rigaltius*, subjoined to *Cyprian's* works, AD. 1650; and again in 1666. The editions with notes, by *Schurtzfleisch*, 1710, and of *Davis*, subjoined to his *Minutius Felix*, Cambr. 1711, 8vo. are the best.

Anatolius, a very scientific ecclesiastic of Alexandria, who by his address, once delivered his townsmen from a siege. He was made bp. of Laodicea in Syria, about AD. 270, and published *canons* for ascertaining Easter, from which *Eusebius* (H. E. vii. 32.) has preserved an extract; and Institutes of arithmetic, in ten Books, of which some fragments still remain.—*Eusebius*, (l. c.) gives a long account of him. See also *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 73.—What remains of his works, has been published, Gr. and Lat. by *Bucherius*, in his *Doctrina Temporum*, Antw. 1634. Fol.

Archelaus, bp. of Carrha in Mesopotamia, flourished about AD. 278. He wrote in Syriac his disputation with *Manes* the heretic; which was early translated into Greek, and thence into Latin. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 72. A large part of the Latin copy, was first published by *Valesius*, subjoined to *Socrates*, *Historia Eccles.* afterwards; together with what remains of the Greek, by *Zaccagnius*, in his Collection of rare works of the Gr. and Lat. church, Rome 1698. 4to. p. 1—102: and lastly, by *Fabricius*, ad finem Opp. S. Hyppoliti, 2 Vol. Fol.

Pierius, a presbyter, and perhaps, catechist of Alexandria. He was of *Origen's* school, very learned in the scriptures, and wrote many discourses and expositions, in a neat and simple style. He was called *Origen Junior*. His long discourse on the prophet Hosea, is particularly noticed by *Jerome*. *Photius* (Biblioth. cxix.) mentions twelve Books of his expositions. He was of an ascetic turn, lived considerably into the fourth century, and spent his latter years at Rome. Nothing of his remains. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 76. and *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 32.

Theognostus, of Alexandria, a friend of *Origen*, and perhaps successor to *Pierius* in the catechetical school. He wrote seven Books of Hypotyposes; of which *Photius* (Biblioth. cvi.) has preserved an abstract. *Photius* deemed him heretical, in regard to the Trinity: but *Athanasius* makes quotations from him, in confutation of the Arians. See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. ix. p. 408.

Lucian, a learned presbyter of Antioch. He adhered for some time to *Paul* of Samosata. To him most of the churches from Syria to Constantinople, were indebted for corrected copies of the Septuagint. *Jerome* mentions him as the author of several theological tracts and letters; and a confession of faith, drawn up by him, is still extant, in *Socrates* Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 10. and in *Walch's* Biblioth. Symbol. Vetus, p. 29 &c. He was a very pious man, and suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, AD. 311.—See *Euseb.* H. E. viii. 13. and ix. 6. and *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 77.

Hesychius, an Egyptian bp. and martyr, was famous at the same period for setting forth correct copies of the Septuagint in Egypt. Whether he was that *Hesychius*, who compiled a useful Greek Lexicon, still extant, is uncertain. He died a martyr, AD. 311. See *Euseb.* H. E. viii. 13. and *Fabricius* Biblioth. Gr. vol. iv. p. 554 &c.

Pamphylus the martyr, was a native of Berytus, but a presbyter of Caesarea in Palestine, where he established a school, and collected a theological library, which has been of immense service to the christian world. This library afforded to *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, and many others, the means of becoming learned divines, and of benefiting the world by their writings. To this establishment, ecclesiastical history and biblical learning, are peculiarly indebted.—*Pamphylus* was a pupil of *Pierius*, an admirer of *Origen*, and the great friend and patron of *Eusebius*. He transcribed most of the works of *Origen*, with his own hand; and he composed a biography and vindication of *Origen*, in five Books, to which *Eusebius* added a sixth book. Only the first book is now extant; and that in a Latin translation of *Ruffinus*, printed inter Opp. *Origenis*.—*Pamphilus* took great pains to multiply and spread abroad correct copies of the holy scriptures.—His life was written by *Eusebius*, in three Books, which are lost. He suffered martyrdom, AD. 309, at Caesarea in Palestine. See *Euseb.* de martyribus Palaestinae, c. 10, and 7. and H. E. vi. 32. vii. 32. and viii. 13. *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 75.

Victorinus, bp. of Petavio in upper Pannonia, (Petau in Steyermark,) wrote Commentaries on Gen. Exod. Levit. Isa. Ezek. Habak. Eccles. Cantic. and the Apocalypse; also a book against all the Heresies. He died a martyr, AD. 303. *Jerome* says, he understood Greek better than Latin; and therefore his thoughts are good, but his style bad.—*Dr. Cave* (Histor. Lit. vol. i.) published a fragment of his Commentary on Genesis. Whether the Commentary on the Apocalypse, now extant under his name, be *his*, has been much doubted; because this comment is opposed to chiliasm, whereas *Jerome* (de Viris Illustr. c. 18.) says, that *Victorinus* favored the sentiments of *Nepos* and the Chiliasts.—See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 74. 77.]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of christian theology.—§ 2. Sources of the mystical theology.—§ 3. Thence the monks and eremites.—§ 4. Attention to the holy scriptures.—§ 5. *Origen's* principles of interpretation.—§ 6. Other interpreters.—§ 7. State of dogmatic theology.—§ 8. Moral or practical theology.—§ 9. Polemic divines.—§ 10. Faults of the disputants.—§ 11. Spurious books.—§ 12. The chiliastic controversy.—§ 13. Controversy respecting the baptism of reclaimed heretics.—§ 14. Disputes concerning *Origen*.

§ 1. To the common people, the principal truths of christianity were explained in their purity and simplicity, and all subtleties were avoided : nor were weak and tender minds overloaded with a multitude of precepts.(1) But in their schools, and in their books, the doctors who cultivated literature and philosophy, and especially those of Egypt, deemed it elegant and exquisite, to subject divine wisdom to the scrutiny of reason, or rather to bring under the precepts of their philosophy, and examine metaphysically, the nature of the doctrines taught by *Christ*. At the head of this class of divines was *Origen*, who being fascinated with the Platonic philosophy, ventured to apply its laws to every part of religion, and persuaded himself that the philosophy which he admired, could assign the causes and grounds of every doctrine, and determine its precise form and nature.(2) He indeed

(1) See *Origen*, in Praef. libror. de Principiis, tom. i. Opp. p. 49. and Lib. i. de Princip. cap. vii. p. 69. ed. de la Rue. also *Gregory* Neocaesar. Expositio Fidei, p. 11. Opp. ed. G. Vossii.

(2) In his *Stromata*, which are lost, and in his work *de Principiis*, which is preserved in the Latin translation of *Ruffinus*.—[See a long Note of Dr. *Mosheim*, on the philosophy and the theology of *Origen*, in his Comment. de Rebus Christianor. p. 604 &c.—It does not appear that *Origen* regarded reason or philosophy as of higher authority than revelation. He believed indeed that there is a true philosophy as well as a false, and that the dictates of the former are to be received and confided in. But he also believed that the scriptures contain a divine revelation, which is to be received and followed with implicit confidence ; and that no philosophy is true which contradicts the plain declarations of the scriptures. At the same time he believed, that the scriptures for the most part only state the simple truths and facts of religion, without explaining the grounds and reasons of them ; and that they state these truths and facts in a plain and popular manner, without acquainting us with the metaphysical nature of the subjects. In his opinion, it was the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate more fully the causes and grounds of these religious truths and facts, and to examine and determine their metaphysical nature.—Such, it appears, were *Origen's* fundamental principles. And how few are they, who in this or in any age, have adopted more consistent views? Yet he erred ; and erred, just as theologians have ever been prone to do, by relying too confidently on the correctness and certainty of what he regarded as the conclusions of true philosophy. For an illustration of the nature and extent of *Origen's* errors, let it be observed, that in the beginning of his book de Principiis § 3. p. 47, he gives the following list of fundamental truths, which he considers as plainly taught in the scriptures, and of

must be acknowledged, to have proceeded in this matter, with timidity and modesty, for the most part ; but his example sanctioned this faulty mode of treating theology, and led his disciples to burst the barriers he prescribed, and to become very licentious in explaining divine truths according to the dictates of philosophy. To these divines as the parents, that species of *theology* which is called philosophic or *scholastic*, owes its birth ; but it afterwards assumed various forms, according to the capacity and erudition of the men who delighted in it.

§ 2. It is a singular circumstance, that another species of *theology* which has been denominated *mystic*, and which has a natural tendency to destroy the former, originated from the same sources, and nearly at the same time. Its authors are unknown ; but its causes and the process of its formation are manifest. Its originators assumed that well known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was approved also by *Origen* and his followers, that *a portion of the divine nature was diffused through all human souls* ; or to express the same thing in other words, that *reason in us is an emanation from God himself, and comprehends the elements or first principles of all truths human and divine*. Yet they denied that men, by their own efforts and care, can excite this divine spark within them ; and therefore they disapproved of the endeavors of men to gain clear perceptions of latent truths by means of definitions, discrimination, and reflection. On the contrary they maintained that, silence, inaction, solitude, repose, the

course as never to be called in question ; viz. (1) There is one God, the creator and father of all. (2) He, in these last days, sent *Christ* to call first the Jews and then also other people. (3) *Jesus Christ* was begotten of the Father before all creatures, and he aided the Father in the whole work of creation. (4) The same *Christ* becoming man, was incarnate, though he was God ; and having become man, he remained God, as he was before ; he assumed a body like to ours, and differing only in this, that it was born of the virgin and of the Holy Spirit ; he really and truly suffered, died, and rose again. (5) The Holy Spirit, in honor and dignity, is joined with the Father and the Son. (6) All rational minds possess entire freedom of choice and volition, and when separated from the body, will be punished or rewarded according to their merits. (7) Our bodies will be raised in a far more perfect state. (8) The devil and his angels are realities, and they seek to involve men in sin. (9) This world will be dissolved. (10) The scriptures were dictated by the Spirit of God ; and they contain a double sense, the one manifest, the other latent. (11) There are holy angels and powers, who minister to the salvation of men. These *Origen* gives as *specimens* only ; for he says : *Hæc sunt species (sorts or specimens) eorum, quæ per prædicationem Apostolicam manifeste traduntur*. Now such general truths as these, *Origen* did not permit to be called in question for a moment. Yet, as before observed, their metaphysical nature and the grounds and reasons of them, he supposed it the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate. And his errors were nearly all in relation to religious philosophy, or ontology and metaphysics. He reasoned, and believed, according to the reigning philosophy of the age and country in which he lived. He therefore believed in the preexistence of human souls, and their incarceration in bodies, for offences previously committed ; that the senses are polluting to the soul, and must be all mortified ; that all rational beings are left of God to follow their own choice, and are restrained only by motives, the most powerful of which is punishment ; and that ultimately God will thus bring all his creatures to be wise and holy and happy. Tr.]

avoidance of all active scenes, and the mortification and subjugation of the body, tended to excite this *internal word* [*λογος* or *reason*,] to put forth its hidden energies, and thus to instruct men in divine things. For the men, who neglect all human affairs, and withdraw their senses and their eyes from the contagious influence of material objects, do, spiritually or with the mind, return to God again; and being united with God, they not only enjoy vast pleasure, but they see in its native purity and undisguised that truth which appears to others only in a vitiated and deformed state.(3)

§ 3. Such reasoning induced many in this age to retire into deserts, and to emaciate their bodies by fasting and hardships. And by such motives, rather than by fear of the Decian persecution, I suppose *Paul* the hermit was led to roam in the deserts of Thebais, and to lead a life more proper for an irrational animal than for a human being.(4) This *Paul* is said to be the author of the institution of Eremites. But this mode of life prevailed among christians long before *Paul* the hermit; in fact it was practised long before the christian era, in Egypt, Syria, India and Mesopotamia, and it still exists among the Muhammedans, as well as the christians in those arid and burning climates.(5) For the heated atmosphere which overspreads those countries naturally disposes the inhabitants to repose and indolence, and to court solitude and melancholy.

§ 4. Among those who laudably employed themselves on the sacred volume, the first place is due to those who took earnest care, that copies of the bible might every where be found accurately written, and at a moderate price; that it might be translated into other languages, and that amended and faultless editions might become common. Many opulent christians of those times are known to have expended no small portion of their estates in furtherance of these objects. In correcting the copies

(3) [In his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 658—667. Dr. *Mosheim* endeavors to shew, that *Origen*, by his religious philosophy, laid the foundations of mystic theology in the christian church. But the evidence he adduces is by no means conclusive. *Tr.*]

(4) His life was written by *Jerome*. [See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp, tom. i. January 10th, p. 602. *Schl.*]

(5) See the *Travels of Paul Lucas*, AD. 1714. vol. ii. p. 363. [The reader will recollect the *Dervises* and *Fakirs*, who roam over the whole country from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Ganges.—*Jerome* reports, in the preface to his life of *Paul* of Thebais, on the questionable authority of *Amathas* and *Macarius*, two disciples of *St. Anthony*, that *Paul* the hermit of Thebais, was the first who practised this mode of life. But high ideas of the sanctity of renouncing social and civilized life and dwelling in deserts among beasts, were prevalent, before *Paul* in the middle of this century turned hermit. Thus *Narcissus*, bishop of Jerusalem, obtained great reputation, in the close of the *second* century, by secreting himself many years in the desert. *Euseb.* H. E. Lib. vi. c. 9, 10. The origin of religious eremitism may perhaps be traced back to the early pagan philosophers; for *Porphyry* (*περί ἀποχρῆς* § 35.) assures us, that the ancient *Pythagoreans* were distinguished for their attachment to this mode of life. *Tr.*]

of the Septuagint version, *Pierius* and *Hesychias* in Egypt, and *Lucian* at Antioch, employed themselves with laudable industry. Nor should the nearly similar efforts of *Pamphilus* the martyr, be passed without notice. But *Origen* surpassed all others in diligence and patient labor in this way. His *Hexapla*, though [nearly] destroyed by the ravages of time, will remain an eternal monument of the incredible application, with which that great man labored to subserve the interests of the church.(6)

§ 5. The same *Origen*, unquestionably, stands at the head of the interpreters of the bible in this century. But with pain it must be added, he was first among those who have found in the scriptures a secure retreat for all errors and idle fancies. As this most ingenious man could see no feasible method of vindicating all that is said in the scriptures, against the cavils of the heretics and the enemies of christianity, provided he interpreted the language of the bible literally, he concluded that he must expound the sacred volume in the way in which the Platonists were accustomed to explain the history of their gods. He therefore taught, that the words, in many parts of the bible, convey no meaning at all; and in some places, where he acknowledged there was some meaning in the words, he maintained that under the things there expressed, there was contained a hidden and concealed sense, which was much to be preferred to the literal meaning of the words.(7) And this hidden sense it is, that he searches

(6) The fragments of this Herculean work which are preserved, have been collected and published by that ornament of the once learned Benedictines, *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, Paris 1713. 2 vol. Fol. See also *J. F. Buddeus*, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, Tom ii. p. 1376 &c. and *J. G. Carpzov*, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.* p. 574.—[*Origen* published both a *Tetrapla* and a *Hexapla*, that is, a *fourfold* and a *sixfold* Bible. The former contained, in parallel columns, (1) *Aquila's* Gr. version; (2) that of *Symmachus*; (3) the Septuagint version; (4) the Gr. version of *Theodotion*. The *Hexapla* contained, throughout, *six* columns, generally *eight*, and occasionally *nine*; thus arranged, (1) The Hebrew text in the Hebrew character; (2) the Hebrew text in Greek characters; (3) *Aquila's* version; (4) that of *Symmachus*; (5) the Septuagint; (6) that of *Theodotion*; (7) and (8) two other Greek versions, whose authors were unknown; (9) another Greek version. The three last, being anonymous versions, are denominated the *Fifth*, *Sixth*, and *Seventh* Greek versions.—The most useful parts of *Montfaucon's* *Hexapla*, with additions, corrections, and notes, have been published in two vols. 8vo. by *C. F. Bahrde*, Lips. 1769—70. Tr.]

(7) Here may be consulted the Preface of *Charles de la Rue* to the second volume of *Origen's* works, ed. Paris 1733, Fol. With greater fulness and precision I have stated and explained *Origen's* system of biblical interpretation, in my *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 629 &c. where also his philosophy, his theology, and his contest with bishop *Demetrius*, are formally taken up and discussed.—[With this may be compared the observations of that distinguished philologist, Professor *Ernesti*, in his *Dissertatio de Origene, interpretationis librorum S. S. grammaticae auctore*, written AD. 1756. *Ernesti* shows that the merits of this christian father, in regard to the criticism and exposition of the O. and N. Testaments, were by no means small.—The leading thoughts of *Dr. Mosheim*, as stated in his *Commentaries de Rebus* &c. are the following. *Origen* was not the inventor of the allegorical mode of expounding the scriptures. It was in use among the Jews, before the christian era. (*Ernesti* goes farther, and seeks its origin in the schools of the prophets.) *Philo* was a great allegorist; and *Pan-*

after in his commentaries, ingeniously indeed, but perversely, and generally to the entire neglect and contempt of the literal

taenus and *Clemens Alex.* were the first christian allegorists. *Origen* took greater liberties in this mode of interpretation; and it was not simply his resorting to allegories, but his excesses in them, that drew upon him enemies. Before his day, all interpreters explained the narrations and the laws contained in the bible, according to their literal meaning. But *Origen* perversely turned a large part of biblical history into moral fables, and many of the laws into allegories. Probably he learned this in the school of *Ammonius*, which expounded *Hesiod*, *Homer*, and the whole fabulous history of the Greeks allegorically. The predecessors of *Origen*, who searched after a mystical sense of scripture, still set a high value on the grammatical or literal sense: but he often expresses himself, as if he attached no value to it. Before him, allegories were resorted to, only to discover predictions of future events, and rules for moral conduct: but he betook himself to allegories, in order to establish the principles of his philosophy on a scriptural basis. All this must have been offensive to many christians. His propensity to allegories must be ascribed to the fertility of his invention, the prevailing custom of the Egyptians, his education, the instructions he received from his teachers, and the example both of the philosophers, of whom he was an admirer, and of the Jews, especially *Philo*. To these may be added other causes. He hoped, by means of his allegories, more easily to convince the Jews, to confute the Gnostics, and to silence the objections of both. This he himself tells us, de Principiis, L. viii. c. 8. p. 164 &c. But we must not forget his attachment to that system of philosophy which he embraced. This philosophy could not be reconciled with the scriptures, except by a resort to allegories; and therefore the scriptures must be interpreted allegorically, that they might not contradict his philosophy. The Platonic idea of a twofold world, a visible and an invisible, and the one emblematic of the other, led him to search for a figurative description of the invisible world, in the biblical history of the nations of the earth. He also believed that it was doing honor to the holy scriptures, to consider them as diverse from all human compositions, and as containing hidden mysteries. See his Homil. xv. on Genesis, Opp. tom. ii. p. 99. and Homil. on Exod. Opp. tom. ii. p. 129. And finally, he thought many of the objections of the enemies of religion, could not be fully answered, without recurrence to allegories.—His general principles for the interpretation of the sacred volume, resolve themselves into the following positions. (1) The scriptures resemble man. As a man consists of three parts, a rational mind, a sensitive soul, and a visible body; so the scriptures have a threefold sense, a *literal* sense, corresponding with the body, a *moral* sense, analogous to the soul, and a *mystical* or *spiritual* sense, analogous to the rational mind. Homil. v. on Levit. § 5. Opp. tom. ii. p. 209.—(2) As the body is the baser part of man, so the *literal* is the less worthy sense of scripture. And as the body often betrays good men into sin, so the literal sense often leads us into error. Stromata. L. x. quoted by *Jerome*. B. iii. Comment. on Galat. ch. iii. Opp. tom. i. p. 41. (3) Yet the literal sense is not wholly useless. De principiis, L. iv. § 12. p. 169. and § 14. p. 173.—(4) They who would see farther into the scriptures than the common people, must search out the *moral* sense. (5) And the perfect, or those who have attained to the highest degree of blessedness, must also investigate the *spiritual* sense. De principiis L. iv. § 2. p. 168.—(6) The *moral* sense of scripture instructs us relative to the changes in the mind of man, and give rules for regulating the heart and life. (7) The *spiritual* sense acquaints us with the nature and state and history of the *spiritual world*. For, besides this material world, there is a spiritual world, composed of two parts, the heavenly and the earthly. The *earthly*, mystical or spiritual world, is the christian church on earth. The *heavenly*, mystical world is above, and corresponds in all its parts with the lower world, which was formed after its model. (8) As the scripture contains the history of this twofold mystic world, so there is a twofold mystic sense of scripture, an *allegorical* and an *anagogical*. (9) The *mystic* sense is diffused throughout the holy scriptures. (10) Yet we do not always meet with *both* the allegorical sense and the anagogical, in every passage. (11) The *moral* sense likewise pervades the whole bible. (12) But the *literal* sense does not occur every where: for many passages have no literal meaning. (13) Some passages have only *two* senses, namely, a *moral* and a *mystical*, [the *mystical* be-

meaning.(8) This remote sense he moreover divides into the *moral*, and the *mystical* or *spiritual*; the former containing instruction relative to the internal state of the soul and our external actions, and the latter acquainting us with the nature, the history and laws of the *spiritual* or *mystical world*. He fancied that this *mystical world* was also twofold, partly *superior* or *celestial*, and partly *inferior* and *terrestrial*, that is, the church: and hence he divided the mystical sense of scripture into the *terrene* or *allegorical*, and the *celestial* or *anagogical*. This mode of interpreting scripture, which was sanctioned by Jewish practice, was current among christians before the times of *Origen*. But as he gave determinate rules for it, and brought it into a systematic form, he is commonly regarded as its originator.

§ 6. Innumerable expositors, in this and the following centuries, pursued the method of *Origen*, though with some diversity; nor could the few who pursued a better method, make much head against them. The commentaries of *Hippolytus*, which have reached us, show that this holy man went wholly into *Origen's* method. And no better, probably, were the expositions

ing either *allegorical* or *anagogical*, rarely both.] other passages have *three* senses, [the *moral*, the *mystical*, and the *literal*.] (14) The *literal* sense is perceived by every attentive reader. The *moral* sense is somewhat more difficult to be discovered. (15) But the *mystic* sense none can discover, with certainty, unless they are wise men, and also taught of God. (16) Neither can even such men hope to fathom all the mysteries of the sacred volume. (17) In searching for the *anagogical* sense, especially, a person must proceed with peculiar care and caution. *Schl.—Dr. Mosheim* states the following as *Origen's* general rule for determining when a passage of scripture may be taken literally, and when not; viz. Whenever the words, if understood literally, will afford a valuable meaning, one that is worthy of God, useful to men, and accordant with truth and correct reason, then the literal meaning is to be retained: but whenever the words, if understood literally, will express what is absurd, or false, or contrary to correct reason, or useless, or unworthy of God, then the literal sense is to be discarded, and the moral and mystical alone to be regarded.—This rule he applies to every part both of the Old Test. and the New. And he assigns two reasons why fables and literal absurdities are admitted into the sacred volume. The *first* is, that if the literal meaning were always rational and good, the reader would be apt to rest in it, and not look after the moral and mystical sense. The *second* is, that fabulous and incongruous representations often afford moral and mystical instruction, which could not so well be conveyed by sober facts and representations. *De Principiis*, L. iv. §. 15, 16. tom. x. Comment. in Joh. Tr.]

(8) *Origen*, in his *Stromata* L. x. cited by *Ch. de la Rue*, Opp. tom. i. p. 41. says: Multorum malorum occasio est, si quis in *carne* Scripturae maneat. Quæ qui fecerint, regnum Dei non consequentur. Quamobrem *spiritum* Scripturae fructusque quæramus, qui non dicuntur manifesti. He had said a little before: Non valde eos juvat Scriptura, qui eam intelligunt, ut scriptum est. Who would suppose such declarations could fall from the lips of a wise and considerate man? But this excellent man suffered himself to be misled by the causes mentioned, and by his love of philosophy. He could not discover in the sacred books all that he considered true, so long as he adhered to the literal sense; but allow him to abandon the literal sense, and to search for recondite meanings, and those books would contain *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Zeno*, and the whole tribe of philosophers. And thus, nearly all those, who would model christianity according to their own fancy or their favorite system of philosophy, have run into this mode of interpreting scripture.

of some books of the Old and New Testaments, composed by *Victorinus*, but which are now lost. But the Paraphrase on the book of Ecclesiastes, by *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, which is still extant, is not liable to the same objection, although its author was a great admirer of Origen. *Methodius* explained the book of Genesis, and the Canticles; but his labors have not reached us. *Ammonius* composed a Harmony of the gospels.

§ 7. *Origen*, in his lost work, entitled *Stromata*, and in his four Books, de Principiis, explained most of the doctrines of christianity, or to speak more correctly, deformed them with philosophical speculations. And these his Books de Principiis were the first compendium of scholastic—or if you please—philosophic theology. Something similar was attempted by *Theognostus*, in his seven Books of *Hypotyposes*; for a knowledge of which we are indebted to *Photius*,⁽⁹⁾ who says, they were the work of a man infected with the opinions of *Origen*. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, in his *Expositio Fidei*, gave a brief summary of christian doctrines. Certain points of the christian faith were taken up by various individuals, in reply to the enemies or the corrupters of christianity. Tracts on the deity, the resurrection, antichrist, and the end of the world, were composed by *Hippolytus*. *Methodius* wrote on free will; and *Lucian* on the creed. But as most of these treatises are no longer extant, their character is little known.

§ 8. Among the writers on moral subjects, (or practical theology,) passing by *Tertullian*, who was mentioned under the preceding century, the first place belongs perhaps to *Cyprian*. From the pen of this extraordinary man, we have treatises on the *advantages of patience*, on *mortality*, on *alms and good works*, and an *exhortation to martyrdom*. In these works there are many excellent thoughts, but they are not arranged neatly and happily, nor sustained by solid arguments.⁽¹⁰⁾ *Origen* wrote, among other works of a practical nature, an *exhortation to martyrdom*; a topic discussed by many in that age, with different degrees of eloquence and perspicacity. *Methodius* treated of chastity, but in a confused manner, in his *Feast of Virgins*. *Dionysius*, of Alexandria, wrote on *penance* and on *temptations*. To mention other writers in this department, would be needless.

§ 9. Of polemic writers, a host might be mentioned. The idolaters were assailed by *Minucius Felix*, in his Dialogue entitled *Octavius*; by *Origen*, in his eight Books *against Celsus*; by *Arnobius*, in his eight Books *against the Gentiles*; and by

(9) [*Photius*, Biblioth. cod. cvi. p. 279. *Photius* represents him as erring, with *Origen*, in regard to the character of the Son of God. But *G. Bull* defends him against this charge, in his *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*, Sec. 2. c. 10. § 7. p. 135.—See concerning him, *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. L. v. c. 1. vol. v. p. 276. and L. v. c. 88. vol. ix. p. 408. *Schl.*]

(10) See *J. Barbeyrac* de la Morale des Peres, c. viii. p. 104, &c.

Cyprian, in his tract *on the Vanity of Idols*. The Chronicon of *Hippolytus*, written against the gentiles, and the work of *Methodius* in opposition to *Porphyry*, who attacked christianity, are lost. We may also place among polemic writers, both those who wrote against the philosophers, as *Hippolytus*, who wrote against *Plato*; and those who treated of *fate*, of *free will*, and of the *origin of evil*, as *Hippolytus*, *Methodius*, and others. Against the Jews, *Hippolytus* attempted something, which has not reached us; but the *Testimonies* [from scripture] *against the Jews*, by *Cyprian*, are still extant. Against all the sectarians and heretics, assaults were made by *Origen*, *Victorinus*, and *Hippolytus*; but nothing of these works has come down to us. It would be superfluous here to enumerate those who wrote against individual heretics.

§ 10. But it must by no means pass unnoticed, that the discussions instituted against the opposers of christianity in this age, departed far from the primitive simplicity, and the correct method of controversy. For the christian doctors, who were in part educated in the schools of rhetoricians and sophists, inconsiderately transferred the arts of these teachers to the cause of christianity; and therefore considered it of no importance, whether an antagonist were confounded by base artifices, or by solid arguments. Thus that mode of disputing, which the ancients called *economical*,⁽¹¹⁾ and which had victory rather than truth for its object, was almost universally approved. And the Platonists contributed to the currency of the practice, by asserting that it was no sin for a person to employ falsehood and fallacies for the support of truth, when it was in danger of being borne down. A person ignorant of these facts will be but a poor judge of the arguments of *Origen*, in his book against *Celsus*, and of the others who wrote against the worshippers of idols. *Tertullian's* method of confuting heretics, namely by *prescription*, was not perhaps altogether unsuitable in that age. But they who think it always proper to reason in this manner, must have little knowledge of the difference which time and change of circumstances produce.⁽¹²⁾

(11) *Souverain*, Platonisme dévoilé, p. 244. *J. Daille*, de vero usu Patrum, L. i. p. 160. *J. C. Wolfii* Casauboniana, p. 100. On the phrase, *to do a thing κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, *Tho. Gataker* has treated largely, in his Notes on M. Antoninus, L. xi. p. 330, &c. [It signifies to do a thing *artfully and dexterously*, or *with cunning and sagacity*, as a *shrewd manager of a household* (οἰκονόμος) controls those under him. Tr.]

(12) See *Fred. Spanheim*, Diss. de Praescriptione in rebus Fidei; Opp. tom. iii. p. 1079.—[*Tertullian's* book was entitled de Praescriptione haereticorum, or Praescriptionibus adversus haereticos; which might be translated, on the *Presumption* in regard to heretics, or *Presumptions* against them. The author attempts to confute all the heretics at once, and by means of historical arguments. He maintains that the orthodox churches were founded by the apostles and their approved assistants, who ordained the first pastors of these churches, and established in them all, one and the same faith, which must of course be genuine chris-

§ 11. This vicious disposition to circumvent and confound an adversary, rather than confute him with sound argument, produced also a multitude of books falsely bearing on their front the names of certain distinguished men. For the greater part of mankind, being influenced more by the authority of names, than by reasons and by divine declarations, the writers conceived they must prefix names of the greatest weight to their books, in order to oppose successfully their adversaries. Hence those *canons*, which were falsely ascribed to the apostles:(13) hence those *Apostolic Constitutions*, which *Clemens Romanus* was reputed to have collected :(14) hence too, the *Recognitions of Clement*,(15) as they are called, and the *Clementina*,(16) and other works of the like character, which a too credulous world long held in high estimation. By the same artifice, the *mystics*, as they are called, sought to advance their cause. Having no answer to give to those who demanded, who was the first author of this new sort of wis-

tianity; and that this faith, having been handed down pure and uncorrupted, is now contained in the creeds and inculcated in the assemblies of *these* churches. But that not one of these things can be said of the heretical churches, which had not such an origin, and embrace various differing creeds, and creeds derived from other sources. Being bred an advocate, and familiar with the proceedings of courts, he gives a forensic form to his argument, not only by using the law term *Praescriptio*, but by maintaining that the orthodox were, and had always been, in right and lawful *possession* of that invaluable treasure, true christianity; and that of course, the heretics, who were never in possession of it, in vain attempt now to *oust* them of what they thus hold by legal *prescription*. *Tr.*]

(13) [The *Apostolic Canons* are eighty five ecclesiastical laws or rules, professedly enacted by the apostles, and collected and preserved by *Clemens Romanus*. The matter of them is ancient; for they describe the customs and institutions of christians, particularly of the Greek and oriental churches, in the *second* and *third* centuries. But the phraseology indicates a compiler living in the *third* century. See *W. Beveridge's* notes on these canons, and his *Codex canonum eccles. primitivae vindicatus et illustrat.* London, 1678, 4to. *Schl.*]

(14) [The *Apostolic Constitutions*, fill eight Books. They prescribe the constitution, organization, discipline, and worship of the church, with great particularity; and avowedly are the work of the apostles themselves. But they are supposed to have been compiled in the eastern or Greek church, in the latter part of the *third* or beginning of the *fourth* century. Some place them in the 4th or 5th century. They bear marks of an Arian hand. As describing the form, discipline, and ceremonies of the church about the year 360, they are of some value. They may be seen in *Cotelierii Patres Apostolici.* tom. ii. *Tr.*]

(15) [The *Recognitions*, of which we have only the Latin translation of *Ruffinus*, compose ten Books, and describe the travels of the apostle *Peter*, and his contests with *Simon Magus*. The work is a pleasant one to read, and helps us to understand the doctrines of the Gnostics. *Dr. Mosheim*, (*Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia.* § 34.) conjectures, with much probability, that it was composed by an Alexandrian Jew, who was opposed to the Gnostics, but himself full of errors, under the forged name of *Clemens Romanus*. *Schl.*]

(16) [The *Clementina* are nineteen Homilies, first published, Gr. and Lat. by *Cotelier*, in his *Patres Apostol.* tom. i. p. 603, &c. They are supposed to have been the work of some Ebionite. *Schl.*—The *Clementina* and the *Recognitions* are works of a similar character. Both profess to give us the history of *St. Peter's* contests with *Simon Magus*, and his private instructions to his particular friends, respecting the mysteries of nature and the deep things of theology. They are downright romance; yet not uninteresting, as specimens of the speculations of semi-christians of a philosophic turn, who lived about A. D. 200. *Tr.*]

dom, they alleged that they received it from *Dionysius*, the Areopagite of Athens, a contemporary with the apostles; and to give plausibility to the falsehood, they palmed upon this great man, books void of sense and rationality.(17) Thus they who wished to surpass all others in piety, deemed it a pious act to employ deception and fraud in support of piety.

§ 12. Among the controversies which divided christians in this century the most considerable were, concerning the *millennium*, the *baptism of heretics*, and concerning *Origen*. That the Savior is to reign a thousand years among men, before the end of the world, had been believed by many in the preceding century, without offence to any: all however, had not explained the doctrine in the same manner, nor indulged hopes of the same kind of pleasures during that reign.(18) In this century the millenarian doctrine fell into disrepute, through the influence especially of *Origen*, who opposed it because it contravened some of his opinions.(19) But *Nepos*, an Egyptian bishop, attempted to revive

(17) [The spurious works ascribed to *Dionysius* the Areopagite, (who is mentioned Acts xvii. 34,) are the following: de Coelesti Hierarchia, Lib. i. de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, L. i. de Divinis Nominibus, L. i. de Mystica Theologia, L. i. together with *four* Epistles to *Caius*, one to *Dorotheus*, one to *Sosipater*, one to *Polycarp*, one to *Demophylus*, one to *Titus*, one to *Apollonphanes*, and *two* to *St. John* the apostle. They all relate to mystic theology, and breathe a devout spirit, but are exceedingly obscure and difficult of comprehension. It is supposed they were written in the 4th or 5th century, as they bear marks of that period, and are not mentioned by any writer prior to the *sixth* century. During the middle ages they were held in high estimation, and their genuineness scarcely if at all questioned. The more devout Catholics and most of the early Protestants, received them and relied upon them as genuine. In the 17th century, their spuriousness was abundantly demonstrated, and they are now universally regarded as supposititious. The best edition of these works, Gr. and Lat. with copious notes, is that of *Balthazar Corderius*, Antwerp, 1634, 2 vols. fol. embracing the Gr. scholia of *St. Maximus* the martyr (A. D. 659.) and the paraphrase of *George Pachymeras*, (A. D. 1280.) The M. S. copies of these works, are found in most of the great libraries of Europe. Tr.]

(18) ["See the learned *Treatise concerning the true millennium*, which *Dr. Whitby* has subjoined to the second volume of his *Commentary upon the New Testament*. See also, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millenarians, the fourth, fifth, seventh, and ninth volumes of *Lardner's Credibility, &c.*" *Macl.*—also *H. Corodi's* kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus, 2d ed. 1794. 3 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

(19) See *Origen*, de Principiis, Lib. ii. c. 11. Opp. tom. i. p. 104. and Prolog. Comment. in Cantic. Cantico. tom. iii. p. 28.—[The *Cerinthians*, *Marcionites*, *Montanists*, and *Melitians*, among the heretical sects, and among the orthodox fathers *Papias*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenaeus*, held to a millennial reign of Christ, and *Irenaeus* understood it in a very gross sense. *Dr. Mosheim*, in his Comment. de rebus Christianor. &c. p. 721, believed the doctrine had a Jewish origin; and he supposed the christian doctors received, or at least tolerated it, because they hoped by it to make the Jews more willing to embrace christianity. But *Dr. Walch*, in his Entwurf einer vollständigen Hist. der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 143. is more discriminating, and maintains that the question, whether a millennial reign of Christ is to be expected, had a biblical origin, the earlier Chiliasts relying on the testimony of the Apocalypse: but the *explanation* of the doctrine was derived from the Jewish opinions. There were two kinds of Chiliasts, the gross, and the refined. The latter placed the chief differences between the millennial reign of Christ and his present reign, in the higher enjoyment of spir-

its authority, in a work written *against the allegorists*, as he contemptuously styled the opposers of the millennium. The book and its arguments were approved by many in the province of Arsinoë, and particularly by *Coracion*, a presbyter of some respectability and influence. But *Dionysius* of Alexandria, a disciple of *Origen*, allayed the rising storm, by his oral discussions and his two *Books on the divine promises*.⁽²⁰⁾

§ 13. As no law determined in what manner those, who came over from heretical churches to the catholic christians, were to be received, different customs prevailed in different churches. Many of the oriental and African christians classed reclaimed heretics among the catechumens, and admitted them to the christian ordinances by baptism. But most of the European christians regarded the baptism administered by errorists as valid; and therefore received reclaimed heretics, simply, with imposition of hands and prayer. This diversity long prevailed, without giving rise to contention. But in this century the Asiatic christians determined in several councils, what before had been left at discretion, that all heretics coming over to the true church, must be re-bap-

itual advantages and pleasures, yet without wholly excluding the pleasures of sense. But the former expected, in the millennium, all kinds of sensual delights, and the free indulgence of all, even the most exorbitant lusts. And these gross Chiliasts are to be found not merely among the heretics; they may be found also among the orthodox, as the example of *Irenaeus* proves. According to the account of *Gennadius* of Marseilles, de Dogmat. ecclesiast. c. 55. p. 32, the Chiliasts may be divided into four classes. The first class were the most moderate. They are called Melitians; and expected a fulfilment of the divine promises here on the earth, without attempting to define the nature of the bliss to be enjoyed during the millennium. The second class expected not only to enjoy the indispensable indulgences of appetite, but also marriage pleasures, and every species of sensual indulgence. The third class promised themselves indeed sensitive delights, and these too as rewards for foregoing them now, and as a compensation for the outward sufferings of saints; but they excluded from them the carnal pleasure of sexual intercourse. The fourth was composed of *Nepos* and his followers. The millennial doctrine did not prevail every where, and uncontradicted. Yet the believers and the rejecters of the doctrine treated each other with affection, and a person might believe or discard it, without bringing his orthodoxy under suspicion. The first open opposer of chiliasm, that we meet with, was *Caius*, a teacher in the church of Rome, towards the end of the second century. He denied that the Apocalypse was written by *John*, and ascribed it rather to *Cerinthus*. But he effected very little. *Origen* was a more powerful opposer of the doctrine. He did not, like *Caius*, deny the canonical authority of the Apocalypse, but explained the passages in it which describe the millennial reign of Christ, allegorically, as referring to spiritual delights, suited to the nature of spirits raised to perfection, and these to be enjoyed, not on the earth, but in the world to come. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. p. 720 &c. and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 136—151. Schl.]

(20) See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. vii. 24. and *Gennadius* Massiliensis, de Dogmatibus ecclesiasticis, cap. 55. p. 32. ed. Elmenhorst.—[*Nepos* held the Apocalypse to be an inspired book; and he maintained, in opposition to the allegorists, that the passages which speak of a millennial reign of Christ, must be understood literally, and as promising corporeal and sensitive pleasures. But he does not appear to have defined clearly what these pleasures were to be, though he excluded eating and drinking and marriage, as *Dr. Mosheim* supposes, l. c. p. 726. The very obscure and defective history of *Nepos*, and the controversy with him, is explained, as far as it can be, by *Dr. Walch*, l. c. p. 152—167. Schl.]

tized.(21) This coming to the knowledge of *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, he with little humanity or prudence, excluded those Asiatics from his fellowship and from that of his church. Notwithstanding this rashness of *Stephen*, *Cyprian* with other Africans, in a council called on the subject, embraced the opinion of the Asiatics, and gave notice of it to *Stephen*. Upon this, *Stephen* was very indignant; but *Cyprian* replied with energy, and in a new council held at Carthage, again pronounced the baptism administered by heretics to be wholly invalid. The rage of *Stephen* now waxed hotter, and he most unjustly excluded the Africans from the rights of brotherhood. But the discord was healed, partly by the moderation with which the Africans conducted themselves, and partly by the death of *Stephen*.(22)

§ 14. The contests concerning *Origen* were moved by *Demetrius* bishop of Alexandria; who is reported, by the friends of *Origen*, to have been influenced by envy and hatred; which however is very doubtful. In the proceedings of *Demetrius* against *Origen*, one may discover marks of a mind exasperated, impassioned, arrogant, and unreasonable, but none scarcely of envy.(23) In the year 228, *Origen* took a journey to Achaia, and on his way suffered himself to be ordained a presbyter by the bishops of Cesarea and Jerusalem. At this, *Demetrius* was greatly offended; because he deemed *Origen* unfit for such an office, on account of his having emasculated himself; and because, being master of a school under him, he had been ordained without his knowledge and consent. The matter however was compromised, and *Origen* returned to Alexandria. But not long after, from some unknown cause, new dissension arose between him and *Demetrius*, which became so great, that *Origen* left Alexandria and the school, in the year 231, and removed to Cesarea in Palestine. *Demetrius* accused him in his absence before an assembled council, and deprived him of his office without a hearing;

(21) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. vii. c. 5, and 7. *Firmilian*, Epist. ad Cyprianum, inter Epp. Cyprian. 75.—[The councils which decided this point, before *Stephen's* rash procedure, were (1) the council of *Carthage*, about AD. 215. See Epp. Cypr. 71 and 73—(2) that of *Iconium* in Phrygia, AD. 235. Epp. Cypr. 75. *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 4.—(3) that of *Synada*, and (4) some others, which are barely mentioned in Epp. Cypr. 75. and *Euseb.* ubi supra. See *Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml. p. 91, 94, and 96. Tr.]

(22) *Cyprian*, Ep. 70, and 73, and several others, ed. Baluze. *Augustine*, de Baptismo contra Donatistas, L. vi. and vii. Opp. tom. ix. where he gives the Acts of the council of Carthage AD. 256. *Prudent. Maron*, vita Cypriani, p. 107, and all the writers of the life of *Cyprian*. [The whole history of this controversy is discussed at large by *Dr. Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus &c. p. 540—547, and still more fully by *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 328—384. Schl.]

(23) [*Dr. Mosheim* is singular in this opinion; which he defends at great length, in his Comment. de Rebus &c. p. 671 &c. in opposition to the express testimony of *Eusebius*, H. E. vi. 8. and *Jerome*, Epist. 29. Opp. tom. iv. P. ii. p. 68. If *Demetrius* was not envious of the growing reputation of *Origen*, or otherwise affected by personal antipathy, it seems impossible to account for the rancor he manifested. Tr.]

and afterwards, in a second council, divested him of his ministerial character. It is probable, that Demetrius accused Origen before the council, particularly the last one, of erroneous sentiments in matters of religion; which it was easy for him to do, as *Origen's* book *de Principiis*, which was full of dangerous sentiments, had been published not long before. The decision of the council at Alexandria was approved by the majority of the christian bishops, though rejected by those of Achaia, Palestine, Phenicia, and Arabia.(24)

(24) This account is derived from the original sources, especially from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. vi. 23. *Photius*, Biblioth. cod. cxviii. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. and *Origen* himself. It differs in some respects from that given by the common writers, *Doucín*, *Huet*, and others.—[That *Demetrius* accused *Origen* of erroneous sentiments, is a mere conjecture of *Dr. Mosheim*. The early writers mention nothing of it, but state distinctly other charges as adduced by the persecuting bishop.—And that *Demetrius* assembled two councils, is not clear: see *Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml. p. 92 &c. Tr.]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS RITES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied.—§ 2. Public worship.—§ 3. Administration of the sacred supper.—§ 4. Baptism.—§ 5. Various other rites.

§ 1. All the monuments of this century which have come down to us, show, that there was a great increase of ceremonies. To the causes of this, which have already been mentioned, may be added the passion for Platonic philosophy, or rather, the popular superstition of the oriental nations respecting demons, which was adopted by the Platonists, and received from them by the christian doctors. For, from these opinions concerning the nature and the propensities of evil spirits, many of these rites evidently took their rise. Hence arose the public exorcisms, the multiplication of fasts, and the aversion to matrimony. Hence the caution not to have intercourse with those, who were either not yet baptized, or had been excluded from the communion of the church; because such were considered as under the power of some evil spirit. And to pass over other things, hence the painful austerities and penances which were enjoined upon offenders.(1)

§ 2. That the christians now had, in most provinces, certain edifices in which they assembled for religious worship, will be denied by no candid and impartial person. Nor would I contend, strenuously, against those who think these edifices were frequently adorned with images and other ornaments.(2) As to the forms of public worship, and the times(3) set apart for it, it is unnecessary here to be particular, as little alteration was made in this century. Yet two things deserve notice. *First*, the public discourses to the people underwent a change. For, not to mention *Origen*, who was the first, so far as we know, that made long discourses in public, and in such discourses expounded the sacred volume, there were certain bishops, who being educated in the schools of the rhetoricians, framed their addresses and exhortations according to the rules of Grecian eloquence; and their example met the most ready approbation. *Secondly*; the use

(1) Whoever desires to look farther into this subject, may consult *Porphyry*, on Abstinence from flesh; and various passages in *Eusebius*, *Praeparat. Evang.* and *Theodoret*; comparing them with the christian institutions.

(2) [Yet there is most ground for the negative. *von Ein.*]

(3) [The regular seasons for public worship were, all Sundays, good Friday, Easter, and Whitsunday. See *Origen*, ag. Celsus, B. viii. p. 833. The anniversaries of the local martyrdoms were also observed. *von Ein.*]

of incense was now introduced, at least into many churches. Very learned men have denied this fact; but they do it in the face of testimony, which is altogether unexceptionable.(4)

§ 3. Those who had the direction of religious worship, annexed longer prayer and more of ceremony to the celebration of the Lord's supper; and this, I suppose, with no bad intentions. Neither those doing penance, nor those not yet baptized, were allowed to be present at the celebration of this ordinance; which practice, it is well known, was derived from the pagan mysteries.(5) That golden and silver vessels were used in it, is testified by *Prudentius*,(6) among others; and I see no reason to doubt the fact, in respect to the more opulent christian churches. The time of its administration was different, according to the state and circumstances of the churches. Some deemed the morning, some the afternoon, and some the evening, to be the most suitable time for its celebration.(7) Neither were all agreed, how often this most sacred ordinance should be repeated.(8) But all believed it absolutely necessary to the attainment of salvation; and therefore they universally wished infants to become partakers of it.(9) The sacred feast, in some places preceded, and in others followed, the Lord's supper.(10)

§ 4. *Baptism* was publicly administered, twice a year, to candidates who had gone through a long preparation and trial,(11) none being present as spectators, but such as had been themselves baptized. The effect of baptism was supposed to be the remission of sins: and the bishop, by the imposition of hands and prayer, it was believed, conferred those gifts of the Holy Spirit

(4) *Wm. Beveridge*, ad Canon. iii. Apostol. p. 461. and his *Codex Canon. vindicatus*, p. 78. [The christians originally abhorred the use of incense in public worship, as being a part of the worship of idols. See *Tertullian*, *Apolog.* c. 42. and *de Corona militis*, c. 10. Yet they permitted its use at funerals, against offensive smells. Afterwards it was used at the induction of magistrates and bishops, and also in public worship to temper the bad air of crowded assemblies in hot countries, and at last degenerated into a superstitious rite. *Schl.*]

(5) [See *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, *Diss. 2 de praejudic. theolog.* § 13. p. 149 &c. and *Jos. Bingham*, *Antiquitates Eccles.* L. x. c. 5. *Schl.*]

(6) *Περὶ ἑσπερίων*, *Hymn.* ii. p. 60. ed. Heinsii, [and *Optatus Milevit.* de schismate Donatist. c. 12. p. 17. *Schl.*]

(7) [See *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 63. p. 104. *Schl.*]

(8) [It was commonly administered every Sunday, as well as on other festival days; and in times of persecution, daily. See *Cyprian*, *de Oratione Domin.* p. 209. *Ep.* 56. p. 90. *Ep.* 54. p. 78. ed. Baluze. *Schl.*]

(9) [They believed that this ordinance rendered persons immortal; and that such as never partook of it, had no hopes of a resurrection. Hence *Dionysius Alex.* (cited by *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 11.) calls it ἀισθητήν μετὰ τῆς κυρίας συναγωγῆς. That children also partook of it, is testified by *Cyprian*, *de Lapsis*, p. 184 and 189. ed. Baluze. See *P. Horn's Historia Eucharist. infantum*, c. 4. § 1. &c. and c. 6. § 3. also *J. Bingham*, *Antiquitates Eccles.* B. xv. ch. 4. § 7. *Schl.*]

(10) [*Chrysostom*, *Homil.* 22. oportet haereses esse, *Opp. tom.* v. *Schl.*]

(11) [In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, B. viii. ch. 32. a three year's preparation was enjoined; yet with allowance of some exceptions. *Schl.*]

which were necessary for living a holy life.(12) Of the principal ceremonies attending baptism, we have before spoken, [Century II. Part II. ch. IV. § 13.] A few things, however, must here be added. None were admitted to the sacred font, until the exorcist had, by a solemn and menacing formula, declared them free from servitude to the prince of darkness and made servants of God. For, after the opinion had become prevalent among christians, that rational souls originated from God himself, and therefore were in themselves holy, pure and morally free, the evil propensities of man must be considered as arising from the body and from matter, or some evil spirit must be supposed to possess the souls of men and impel them to sin. The Gnostics all embraced the first supposition; but the catholics could in no wise embrace it, because they held that matter was created by God and was not eternal. They had therefore to embrace the second supposition, and to imagine some evil demon, the author of sin and of all evil, to be resident in all vicious persons.(13) The persons baptized returned home, decorated with a crown and a white robe; the first being indicative of their victory over the world and their lusts, the latter of their acquired innocence.(14)

§ 5. Greater sanctity and necessity were now attributed to *fasting*, than was done before; because it was the general belief that demons laid fewer snares for the abstemious and those who faired hard, than for the full fed, or such as lived generously.(15) The Latins were singular in keeping every seventh day of the week as a fast;(16) and as the Greek and oriental christians would not imitate them in this, it afforded abundant matter for altercation between them.—Ordinarily christians *prayed* three times a day, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, [9. A. M. 12 Noon, and 3. P. M.] as was the custom of the Jews. Besides these regular hours

(12) This may be placed beyond all controversy by many passages from the fathers of this century. And as it will conduce much to an understanding of the theology of the ancients, which differed in many respects from ours, I will adduce a single passage from *Cyprian*. It is in his Epist. 73. p. 131. *Manifestum est autem, ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari possit, quæ in baptismo scilicet datur.*—Qui vero praepositis ecclesiae offeruntur, per nostram orationem et manus impositionem *Spiritum Sanctum consequuntur*. See also a passage from *Dionysius Alex.* in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 8.

(13) That *exorcism* was not annexed to baptism, till some time in the *third* century, and after the admission of the Platonic philosophy into the church, may almost be demonstrated. The ceremonies used at baptism, in the *second* century, are described by *Justin Martyr*, in his second Apology, and by *Tertullian*, in his book de Corona militis. But neither makes any mention of exorcism. This is a cogent argument, to prove that it was admitted by christians, after the times of these fathers, and of course in the *third* century. Egypt perhaps first received it.

(14) [Perhaps also of their *freedom*.—See C. G. Schwarz, Diss. de ceremoniis et formulis a veterum manumissione ad Baptismum translatis. *Cyprian* refers to the *white garments*; de Lapsis, p. 181. Schl.]

(15) Clementina, Homil. ix. § 9. p. 688 &c. *Porphyry*, de Abstinencia, Lib. iv. p. 417 &c. and others.

(16) [See Concilium Eliberitanum, Canon 26. Schl.]

of prayer, they prayed much and often; for they considered it the highest duty of a holy man to hold converse with God.(17) On joyful and festive occasions, when giving thanks to God, they thought it suitable to pray standing, thus expressing their joy and confidence by the posture of their bodies. But on sorrowful occasions and seasons of fasting and humiliation, they were accustomed to make their supplications on their bended knees or prostrate, to indicate self-abasement.(18) That certain *forms of prayer* were every where used, both in public and in private, I have no doubt;(19) but I am likewise confident, that many persons poured out the feelings of their hearts before God in free and unpremeditated effusions.—They supposed there was great efficacy in the *sign of the cross*, against all sorts of evils, and particularly against the machinations of evil spirits; and therefore no one undertook any thing of much moment, without first crossing himself.(20)—Other ceremonies I pass by without notice.

(17) [See *Cyprian*, de Oratione, p. 214. *Schl.*]

(18) [See *Cyprian*, de Oratione, p. 214. and *Constitut. Apostol.* L. ii. c. 59. *Schl.*]

(19) [In the earliest times, exclusive of the short introductory salutation: Pax vobiscum &c. no established forms of prayer were used in public worship, but the bishop or presbyter poured forth extempore prayers. See *Justin Martyr*, *Apolo-*
gy ii. The Lord's prayer was used, not only as a pattern, but also as a formula of prayer. Yet only the baptized, and not the catechumens, might utter it. *Tertullian*, de Oratione c. 1, 9. *Cyprian*, de Oratione Domin. *Constitut. Apostol.* L. vii. c. 44. Afterwards various forms were gradually introduced, and particularly of short prayers, derived from passages of scripture. When greater uniformity in the churches as to ceremonies was introduced, the smaller churches had to regulate their forms of prayer conformably to those of the larger churches, and of course to adopt the formulas of the metropolitan churches. *Origen*, contra Celsum, L. vi. and *Homilia in Jerem.* *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini Mag. L. iv. c. 19, 20, 17. *Hist. Eccles.* L. ii. c. 17. *Lactantius*, de Morte persecutor. c. 46, 47. See *Baumgarten's* Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthümer, p. 432. *Schl.*]

(20) [The christians at first used the sign of the cross to bring to remembrance the atoning death of *Christ*, on all occasions. Hence *Tertullian*, de Corona militis, c. 3. p. 121, says: ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calciatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quaecunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus. Compare also his work, ad Uxorem, Lib. ii. So late as the second century, the christians attached no particular virtue to the sign of the cross, and they paid it no adoration. See *Tertullian*, *Apologet.* c. 16. and ad Nationes c. 12. But afterwards, powerful efficacy began to be ascribed to it. See *Cyprian*, *Testimonia adv. Judaeos*, L. ii. c. 21, 22. p. 294. and *Lactantius*, *Institut.* L. iv. c. 27, 28. *Schl.*]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF DIVISIONS AND HERESIES IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the ancient sects.—§ 2. Manes and the Manichaeans.—§ 3. His principles.—§ 4. His doctrine concerning man.—§ 5. Concerning the nature of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.—§ 6. Concerning the offices of Christ and the Comforter.—§ 7. Concerning the purification and future condition of souls.—§ 8. Concerning the state of souls not purified.—§ 9. His opinion of the Old and New Testaments.—§ 10. The severity of his moral principles, and the classification of his followers.—§ 11. The sect of the Hieracites.—§ 12. The Noëtian controversy.—§ 13. Sabellius.—§ 14. Beryllus.—§ 15. Paul of Samosata.—§ 16. Disturbances in Arabia.—§ 17. Novatian controversy.—§ 18. Severities of the Novatians towards the lapsed.

§ 1. Most of the sects which disquieted the church in the preceding centuries, caused it various troubles also in this. For the energies of the Montanists, Valentinians, Marcionites, and other Gnostics, were not wholly subdued by the numerous discussions of their tenets. *Adelphius* and *Aquilinus*, of the Gnostic tribe, but very little known, endeavored to insinuate themselves and their doctrines into the esteem of the public at Rome and in Italy.(1). But these, and others of the same clan, were resisted by *Plotinus* himself, the coryphaeus of the Platonists of this age, and by his disciples with no less boldness and energy, than the orthodox christians were accustomed to manifest. For the philosophical opinions of this faction, concerning God, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and other subjects, could not possibly meet the approbation of the Platonists. These united forces of the christians and the philosophers, were doubtless competent to bring the Gnostics, gradually, to lose all credit and influence among the well informed.(2)

§ 2. While the christians were struggling with these corrupters of the truth, and upon the point of gaining the victory, [a little past the middle of this century,] a new enemy, more fierce

(1) *Porphyry Vita Plotini*, c. 16, p. 118, &c.

(2) The book of *Plotinus* against the Gnostics, is still extant among his works. *Ennead* ii. Lib. ix. p. 213, &c. [*Dr. Semler*, in his *Historiae Eccles. Selecta Capita*, vol. i. p. 81. conjectures, and not without reason, that the Gnostics, and all the assailants of the Old Testament, lost their power, after *Origen* introduced the allegorical and tropological mode of expounding scripture, and extended it in some measure to the history of Christ. And as he further supposes, the labors of *Dionysius Alex.* and other learned fathers, e. g. *Dorotheus*, a presbyter of Antioch, (who understood the Hebrew; *Eusebius*, H. E. vii. 32.) may have contributed much to diminish the Gnostic party, as they carried investigation farther, and more lucidly confuted the Jewish notions, and at the same time approximated a little towards the Gnostic doctrines concerning the Son of God. Hence it is, we hear no more about the Gnostics in this century; and the few who still remained, united themselves with the Manichaeans. *Schl.*]

and dangerous than those, suddenly appeared in the field. *Manes*, (3) whom his disciples called *Manichæus*, (4) a Persian, (5) educated among the Magi, and himself one of the Magi before he became a christian, was instructed in all the sciences and arts that were in repute among the Persians and the adjacent nations, and was an astronomer, (though a rude one,) a physician, a painter, and a philosopher; but he had an exuberant imagination, and, as appears very probable, was delirious and fanatical. This man adventured to combine the principles of the Magi with christianity, or rather to explain the latter by the former. To facilitate the accomplishment of this object, he gave out that *Christ* had left the way of salvation imperfectly explained, and that he himself was the *Paraclete* whom the Saviour promised to send to his disciples when he left the world. Many were seduced by his eloquence, his grave aspect, and the simplicity and innocence of his life; and in a short time he established a sect. But at last he was put to death by *Varanes I.* king of the Persians. The cause, time, and manner of his execution are variously stated by the ancients. (6)

(3) [The Oriental writers call him *Mani*; (*Hyde*, de Relig. vet Persarum, c. 21, and *de Herbelot*, Bibliotheque orientale, art. *Mani*;) but the Greeks and Latins call him *Μάνης*, *Μάνεις*, and *Manes*. See *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 691. *Schl.*]

(4) [See the *Acta Archelai*, c. 5, 49. *Augustine*, de Haeresib. c. 46. and contra Faustum, Lib. xix. c. 22. *Schl.*]

(5) [Notwithstanding the Greek and Oriental writers represent *Manes* as being a Persian, *Dr. Walch* (*Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 708.) and *Beausobre* (*Histoire critique de Manichée*, tome i. p. 66) think it more probable that he was a Chaldean; because *Ephraim Syrus* expressly so states, *Opp. Syro-Latin*. tom. ii. p. 468. and because *Archelaus*, in his *Acta cum Manete*, c. 36, charges *Manes* with understanding no language but that of the Chaldees. *Schl.*]

(6) All that is extant concerning the life, the deeds, and the doctrines of this very singular genius, has been very carefully collected, and reviewed ingeniously—though often with more ingenuity and copiousness than were necessary—by *James de Beausobre*, in his *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manicheisme*, published at Amsterdam, 1734—39. 2 vol. 4to.—[Whoever would gain the best acquaintance with the history of *Manes* and the *Manichæans*, may consult, besides *Beausobre*, *ubi supra*; the long essay of *Dr. Mosheim*, in his *Comment. de Rebus &c.* p. 728—903; *Jo. Christ. Wolf*, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos &c.* Hamb. 1707. 8vo; *Nath. Lardner's* *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 364—753; and *Dr. C. W. F. Walch's* *Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 685—814. These principal writers being consulted, all the rest may be neglected. The last of these works has the great advantage, that it concentrates, arranges properly, criticises acutely and solidly, and expresses in a lucid and agreeable style, all that has been said on the subject by the useful *Wolf*, the agreeable and learned but prolix *Beausobre*, the acute *Mosheim*, and the solid and critical *Lardner*.—*von Ein.*—The original sources for the history of *Manes* and his sect according to *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus &c.* p. 729 &c. are, besides the ancient historical writers, *Epiphanius*, *Augustine*, *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Damascenus*, and *Philastrius*, (I.) what remains of the writings of *Manes* himself and his followers; viz. (a) *Manetis Epistola Fundamenti*, in *Augustine*, contra Ep. Fundamenti; (b) a fragment of his *Sermo de Fide*, in *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxvi. 14. (c) his *Epistola ad Marcellum*, in the *Acta Archelai cum Manete*, p. 6. ed. Zaccag. (d) some fragments of his *Epistola ad Menoch.* in *Augustine*, adv. Julianum Pelagian. (e) several extracts from his Epistles, in J. A.

§ 3. The religious system of *Manes* is a compound of christianity and the ancient philosophy of the Persians, which he had

Fabricius, Biblioth. Gr. vol. v. p. 284.—(f) *Acta disputationis Archelai, Episc. Mesopot. cum Manete*, inter Collectanea monumentor. veteris Eccles. Graecae et Latinae, published by *L. A. Zaccagnius*, Rome, 1698. 4to. also, inter Opp. *Hippolyti*, vol. ii. ed. *Fabricii*. (The genuineness of these *Acta* is questioned by *Beausobre*; but without good reason.) (g) many quotations from *Faustus* the Manichaeon, in *Augustine's* 33 Books contra *Faustum Manichaeum*: (h) various statements of his antagonists, contained in *Augustine's* 2 Books, de *Actis cum Felice Manichaeo*; and in his book contra *Fortunatum Manichaeum*.—(II.) the writings of the fathers, who attempted to confute *Manes* and his followers; viz. (a) *Augustine*, de *Haeresibus*, and in the works above mentioned, (I. a, g, and h.)—(b) *Titus* of Bostra, Libri III. contra *Manichaeos*, Gr. and Lat. inter *Lectiones Antiquas*, ed. *Canisii*; et denuo, *J. Basnagii*, tom. i. p. 156 &c. (c) *Didymus Alexandrinus*, Liber contra *Manichaeos*, Gr. and Lat. in the same *Lectiones Antiq.* tom. i. p. 197. (d) *Alexander Lycopolitanus*, the philosopher, Liber contra *Manichaei opiniones*, Gr. and Lat. in the *Auctarium noviss. Biblioth. Patr.* ed. *Combesis*, tom. ii. p. 260.—*Tr.*—In regard to the history of *Manes*, there is much disagreement between the Oriental and the Grecian writers. Yet in the particulars stated in the text, there is no disagreement. We will extract from *Mosheim's* Commentaries, p. 734 &c. so much as is necessary to give a full history of this extraordinary man.—*Manes* on meeting with the books of the christians, found that the religion they contained, coincided with his philosophy in some respects, and contradicted it in others. He determined to unite the two together, to enlarge and improve the one by the other, and thus to give the world a new religion. He began by giving out that he was the *Paraclete*, (*ὁ παράκλητος*, Joh. xvi. 7, 13 &c.) and perhaps he really supposed he was so. But he was not so deranged and carried away by his imagination, as to be unable to frame a consistent system, and to discover what would tend to confirm it, and what to weaken it. He therefore rejected or altered such books of the christians as contravened his opinions, and substituted others in their place, particularly those which he pretended were written by himself under a divine impulse. The king of Persia threw him into prison; but for what cause, is unknown. The Greek writers, (especially *Archelaus*, in his *Acta cum Manete*, who furnished the other Greek and Latin writers with nearly all the historical facts they state,) represent that he was imprisoned, because, having promised to cure the king's son, he failed, and caused the death of the young prince. A different account is given by the oriental writers, (Persian, Syrian, and Arabian, cited by *de Herbelot*, *Bibliothèque Orient. Art. Mani*; *Tho. Hyde*, *Historia relig. veter. Persarum*, c. 21. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 42. *Edw. Pocock*, *Specimen Hist. Arabum*, p. 149 &c.) They state that *Manes*, coming to the court of king *Sapor*, was received kindly; and that his doctrines were embraced by the monarch. Hereupon *Manes* became so bold as publicly to attack the Persian religion. This drew on him persecution, and so endangered his life that he was obliged to flee into Turkistan. Here he collected many followers, and spent a whole year in a cave, where he composed his book entitled *Erteng* or *Arzeug*, i. e. the Gospel, and which is adorned with splendid paintings. This book he represented to be a gift of God. In the mean time *Sapor* died, and was succeeded by his son *Hormisdas*; who was so favorable to *Manes*, as to embrace his religion, and to allow him to build a castle in which he might be safe from all plots. Perhaps *Hormisdas* was a favorer of *Manes*, in the life time of his father. And *Dr. Mosheim* conjectures, (*Comment. &c.* p. 739.) that the Grecian story of his fatal attempt to cure the king's son, was an oriental allegory, which the Greeks construed literally; that the disease was ignorance, the medicine instruction, the physician the teacher, and the death of the patient his apostacy from the religion of his progenitors: [all which is very improbable, and indeed inconsistent; for the king, having himself embraced the doctrine of *Manes*, would not have imprisoned him, for converting his son to the same religion.]—After the death of *Hormisdas*, *Veranes* I. succeeded to the throne. He was at first well disposed towards *Manes*, but soon turned against him and determined on his destruction. For this purpose he allured him from his safe retreat, under pretence of a disputation with the Magi, and caused him to be put to death as a perverter of the true religion.

imbibed in early life. What the Persians relate concerning their *Mithras*, Manes applied to *Christ*. According to his views and those of the Persians, there are two first principles of all things, a subtile and very pure substance, or *light*, and a gross and corrupt substance, or *darkness*. Over each of these a Lord has reigned from all eternity. The Lord of *light*, is denominated *God*; the regent of the *world of darkness*, is called *Hyle*, (ὕλη, *matter*,) or *daemon* (the *devil*.) These two Lords are of opposite natures and dispositions. The Lord of *light*, as he is himself happy, so he is beneficent; the Lord of *darkness*, being himself miserable, wishes others also to be miserable, and is malignant. Each has produced a numerous progeny of his own peculiar character, and distributed them over his empire.

§ 4. For a long period of time, the Prince of darkness was ignorant of the existence of light, and of the world of light. But on occasion of a war that arose in his kingdom, he gained some knowledge of the light; and on discovering it, he was eager to get possession of it. The Lord of light opposed him with an army; but the general of the celestial army, whose name was *The first Man*, was rather unsuccessful; and the troops of darkness succeeded in getting possession of a considerable portion of the celestial elements, and of light itself, which is an animate substance; and these they mixed with depraved matter. The next general on the side of the world of light, called *The living Spirit*, conducted the war more successfully: yet he was unable to liberate the celestial substance that was now in combination with the vicious elements. The vanquished Prince of darkness now produced the parents of the human race. The men who are born of this stock, consist of a body formed from the depraved matter of the world of darkness, and of two souls, the one sensitive and concupiscent which they derived from the Prince of darkness, the other rational and immortal, it being a particle of that divine light which was plundered by the army of darkness and immersed in matter.

§ 5. Men being thus formed by the Prince of darkness, and minds, which were the daughters of eternal light, being inclosed in their bodies; God now, by the *living Spirit*, who had before vanquished the Prince of darkness, formed this our earth, out of vicious matter; that it might become the residence of the human race, and might afford God advantages for gradually delivering souls

This took place in the year 278; or, according to *Dr. Walch*, (*Hist. der Ketzeren*, vol. i. p. 724,) in the year 277.—The shocking fate of *Manes*, rather animated than terrified his followers. The most able and eloquent of them roamed through Syria, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and over most parts of the world; and by the severity of their morals and the simplicity of their religion, they every where made proselytes. And notwithstanding all the persecutions that have befallen them, their descendants exist to this day, in the mountains between Persia and India. *Schl.*]

from their bodies, and separating the good matter from the bad. Afterwards God produced from himself two *majestic beings*, who should afford succour to the souls immured in bodies; namely, *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. *Christ* is the being, whom the Persians call *Mithras*: he is a most splendid substance, consisting of the purest light of God, self-existent, animate, excelling in wisdom, and having his residence in the sun. The *Holy Spirit* likewise is an animate and lucid substance, which is diffused through the whole atmosphere that encompasses our earth, warms and enlightens the souls of men, fecundates the earth, elicits gradually from it the latent particles of divine fire, and wafts them upward, that they may return to their native world.

§ 6. After God had, for a long time, admonished the captive souls immured in bodies, by angels and by men instructed by himself; he at length, in order to accelerate their return to the heavenly country, directed *Christ*, his son, to descend from the sun to this our world. He being clad in the form and shadow of a human body, but not joined to a real body, appeared among the Jews, pointed out the way in which souls may extricate themselves from the body, and proved his divinity(7) by his miracles. But the Prince of darkness instigated the Jews to crucify him. This punishment however he did not actually endure, because he had not a body; but the people supposed he was crucified. Having accomplished his embassy, *Christ* returned to the sun, his former residence; and left in charge to his apostles, to propagate the religion he had taught them, throughout the world. Moreover, when about to depart, he promised to send, at some time, a greater and more perfect apostle, whom he called the *Paraclete*, who should add many things to the precepts he had delivered, and dispel all errors in regard to religious subjects. This *Paraclete*, promised by *Christ*, was *Manes* the Persian, who by command of God, explained the whole doctrine of salvation, perfectly, and without any ambiguity or concealment.

§ 7. The souls which believe *Jesus Christ* to be the Son of God, renounce the worship of the God of the Jews, (who is no other than the Prince of darkness,) obey the laws, which were given by *Christ* and enlarged and explained by *Manes*, the *Paraclete*, and perseveringly resist the lusts of the evil soul, these shall progressively become purified from the contaminations of base matter. Yet the entire purgation of the soul cannot be effected in the present life. Therefore souls, when freed from the

(7) [Not his *Divinity*: for this, in the true and proper sense of the word, the Manichaeans could not predicate of *Christ*, nor of the *Holy Ghost*. They held neither of them to be more ancient than the world. See *Fortunatus*, in his dispute with *Augustine*, I. p. 69. They believed that the *light* of the *Son* might be obscured by intervening matter, but that the *light* of the *Father* could not. See *Mosheim*, comment. de Rebus &c. p. 775 &c. *Schl.*]

body, must undergo a twofold purification, after death, before they are admitted into the world of light; the first purification is by sacred *water*, and the second, by sacred *fire*. They first go to the *moon*, which consists of sacred *water*; and in that they are purified during fifteen days; thence they proceed to the *sun*, the holy *fire* of which removes entirely all their remaining pollution. The bodies which they left behind, being formed of base matter, revert back to their original mass.

§ 8. But the souls which have neglected the means for their purgation, will, after death, pass into other bodies, either of animals or of other beings, until they become cleansed. Some also, being peculiarly depraved, will be delivered over to the evil demons inhabiting our atmosphere, to be tormented for a season. When the greater part of the souls shall be liberated and be restored to the world of light, then, at the command of God, infernal fire will burst from the caverns in which it is contained, and will burn up and destroy the fabric of this world. After these events, the Prince and powers of darkness will be compelled to retire to their wretched country, where they must remain forever. For, to prevent their renewing war against the world of light, God will encompass the world of darkness with an invincible guard. That is to say, the souls whose salvation has become desperate, will keep watch like soldiers about the world of darkness, so that its miserable inhabitants can no more go out.

§ 9. To give these monstrous opinions some plausibility, *Manes* rejected nearly all the sacred books, in which the christians believed their religion was contained. The *Old Testament*, especially, he pronounced to be the work, not of God, but of the Prince of darkness, whom he represented the Jews as worshipping in place of the true God. The four histories of *Christ*, which we call *Gospels*, he either denied to have been composed by the apostles, or he maintained that if they were so, they had been corrupted, interpolated, and stuffed with Jewish fables by crafty and deceitful men. In place of them he substituted another Gospel which he denominated *Erteng*, and which he affirmed had been dictated to him by God himself. The *Acts of the Apostles*, he wholly rejected. The *Epistles* which are ascribed to *St. Paul*, he admitted to have been written by him, but maintained that they were adulterated. What he thought of the other books of the New Testament, we are not informed.

§ 10. The rules of life which *Manes* prescribed for his followers, were peculiarly rigorous and severe. For he directed them to mortify and macerate the body, which he regarded as the very essence of evil, and the work of the Prince of darkness; to deprive it of every convenience and gratification, to extirpate every sensual appetite, and to divest themselves of all the propensities and instincts of nature. But as he foresaw, that he could expect few

to embrace his system, if he imposed upon all, without discrimination, such severe rules of life; he divided his followers into two classes, the *elect* and the *hearers*, that is, the *perfect* christians and the *imperfect*.⁽⁸⁾ The former, or the *elect*, were to abstain from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and every inebriating drink, from marriage, and from every indulgence of sexual passions, to live in the most abject poverty, to sustain their emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse, and melons, to abstain from all active life, and to be devoid both of love and hatred. A milder rule was prescribed for the *hearers*. They might possess houses, lands, and goods, eat flesh, though sparingly, and marry wives: yet even these indulgences had their limitations. The whole body of Manichaeans were subjected to one president, who represented *Jesus Christ*; with him were connected twelve *masters*, or rulers, who represented the twelve apostles; next to these, there were seventy two *bishops*, corresponding with the seventy two disciples of Christ; and under each bishop, there were *presbyters* and *deacons*. All these officers were from the class of the *elect*.⁽⁹⁾

§ 11. The sect of the *Hieracites* was formed in Egypt, near the close of this century, by *Hierax* of Leontopolis, who was a book-maker by trade, a man of learning and venerable for the visible sanctity of his deportment. Many have supposed, that this sect was a branch of the Manichaean family; but erroneously: for although *Hierax* held some notions in common with *Manes*, yet he differed from him in many respects. He believed it was the great business of *Christ* to promulge a *new law*, more

(8) [The *elect* were also called the *faithful*, or *believers*; and the *hearers* were called *catechumens*. The former were either *baptized*, or *unbaptized*. If baptized, they could not change their condition; if unbaptized, they might return to the class of *hearers*, if they found themselves unable to endure the rigorous discipline of the perfect. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c. p. 896 &c. *Schl.*]

(9) All these particulars are more fully stated, and supported by citations from antiquity, in my Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c. [pa. 728—903.—with which, the reader should compare *Dr. Walch's* historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i. p. 685—814. From both, we extract the following notices, respecting the *worship* of this sect. They revered the sun and the moon, though they did not account them deities. Their worship was so simple, that they claimed to be farther removed from paganism, than all other christians. They had no temples, no altars, no images, no oblations, and no burning of incense. They observed Sundays, which they kept as fasts. But they observed none of the christian festivals, which relate to the incarnation and baptism of *Christ*. They celebrated the memorial of *Christ's* death, but with little of devotion. Whether they observed Easter, is uncertain. But they observed the anniversary of *Manes'* death, which they called *Bama*, with great devotion. *Fasting* was one of their most important religious exercises. They kept sacred Sundays and Mondays. They made use of *baptism*; but did not baptize either children, or grown persons who were only *hearers*; and even to the *elect*, it was left optional, whether they would be baptized or not. The *elect* observed likewise the *Lord's Supper*; though it is not known what they used in place of wine, which was with them altogether prohibited. *Schl.*]

perfect and more strict than that of *Moses*. Accordingly, he held that *Christ* had prohibited to his followers, marriage, flesh, wine, and whatever was grateful to the senses or the body : which things had been allowed of by *Moses*, but were abrogated under the new law. Yet if we duly consider all accounts, we shall conclude that *Hierax*, as well as *Manes*, did not suppose these severe injunctions were imposed by *Christ* on *all* his followers, but only on those who aspired after the highest attainments in virtue. To this radical error, he added others, either growing out of it, or originating from other sources. For example, he excluded infants, who died before they came to the use of reason, from the kingdom of heaven ; because divine rewards could be due to none but such as had actually passed through regular conflicts with the body and its lusts. He also maintained, that *Melchisedek*, the king of Salem who blessed Abraham, was the *Holy Spirit*. The resurrection of the body, he denied : and the whole sacred volume, and especially its historical parts, he obscured with allegorical interpretations.(10)

§ 12. The controversies respecting the divine *Trinity*, which commenced in the preceding century, from the time when Grecian philosophy got into the church, had a wider spread in this century, and produced various methods of explaining that doctrine. First, [in the early part of the century,] *Noetus*, a man of whom little is known, a native of Smyrna, maintained that *God* himself, whom he denominated the *Father*, and held to be absolutely *one and indivisible* ; united himself with the man *Christ*, whom he called the *Son* ; and, in him, was born and suffered. From this dogma of *Noetus*, his adherents were called *Patripassians* ; i. e. persons who held that the great *Parent* of the universe himself, and not merely some *one person* of the Godhead, had made expiation for the sins of men. Nor were they unfitly denominated so, if the ancients correctly understood their views.(11)

(10) *Epiphanius*, *Haeres*, lxxvii. [and *Augustine*, *Haeresib.* c. 47.] from whom nearly all others have borrowed, with little exception, all they state. [See *Mosheim*, *de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 903—910. *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. i. p. 815—823. *Tillemont*, *Mem. pour servir à l'Hist. Eccles.* tom. iv. p. 411. and *Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel Hist.* Pt. ii. vol. vi. p. 76 &c. *Schl.*]

(11) See *Hippolytus*, *Sermo contra Haeresin Noeti*, in liis *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 5. ed. *Fabricii* ; *Epiphanius*, *Haeres*, lvii. *Opp.* tom. i. p. 479 : *Theodoret*, *haeret. Fabul.* L. iii. c. 3. *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 227.—[*Noetus* so held the *unity* of God, as to discard the orthodox opinion of a plurality of persons in the Godhead. In fact he acknowledged but *one person* ; who is designated in the scriptures by the title of the *Father*. *Noetus* therefore was a *Unitarian*, as respects the doctrine of *three persons* ; but in regard to the character of *Christ*, he held better views than the *Socinians*. So far as relates to two natures united in one person, in *Christ*, he agreed with the orthodox ; but the divine person, which was united with the human nature, according to *Noetus's* views, was no other than the person of the *Father*, because there was no other person in the Godhead. See *Mosheim*, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 681—687 ; and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 1—13. *Schl.*]

§ 13. From the middle of the century onward, appeared *Sabellius*, an African presbyter or bishop, at Ptolemais the principal city in Pentapolis, a province of Libya Cyrenaica. He explained what the scriptures teach concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in a manner somewhat different from *Noëtus*; and gathered a number of followers, although he was confuted by *Dionysius* of Alexandria. *Noëtus* had supposed, that God the Father, *personally*, assumed the human nature of Christ: but *Sabellius* held that only a certain *energy*, put forth by the supreme Parent, or a certain *portion* of the divine nature being separated from it, became united with the *Son*, or the man *Christ*. And the *Holy Spirit*, he considered as being a similar portion or part of the eternal Father.(12) Hence it appears, that the *Sabellians*

(12) Most of the ancients who wrote against the heretics, speak of *Sabellius*; [especially *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxii. and *Theodoret*, *haeret. Fabul.* L. ii. c. 9.] To these, add *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. vi. c. 6. *Athanasius*, *de sententia Dionysii*; [and *Basil the Great*, *Ep.* 210, and 235.] Nearly all that is written by the ancients, has been collected by *Christopher Wormius*, in his *Historia Sabelliana*, *Francf. and Lips.* 1696, 8vo. a learned work, only a small part of which relates to *Sabellius*.—[See *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c.* p. 688—699. (*J. Beausabre*, *Histoire de Manichée &c.* tome i. p. 533 &c. *N. Lardner*, *Credibility of the Gosp. Hist.* Pt. ii. vol. p. 558 &c.) and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 14—49.—The last of these differs some from *Dr. Mosheim*, in his description of the Sabellian doctrine. We would place the two accounts side by side, without attempting to decide so difficult a question.—The most common opinion respecting the Sabellian doctrine, was this: *Sabellius* admitted but *one person* in the divine essence; or he denied that the Father was one person, the Son another person, and the Holy Spirit a third; of course he discarded the inherent distinction of three persons. He admitted a difference only of *names*, and of some external *relations* to creatures, in regard to the government of the world and of the church; and he ascribed to the Son, those works which we regard as the personal acts of the Father; and on the other hand, he ascribed to the Father, the acts and the sufferings of the Son. Now *Dr. Mosheim* concedes, that *Sabellius* taught there was but *one divine person*; but he maintains also, that *Sabellius* admitted a *Trinity*, and a real *difference* between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; though this difference was neither an essential, nor a personal one; the divine *three* were not three distinct *persons*, but three *portions* of the divine nature, all depending on God, and at the same time differing from God, and from each other. That portion, by which God made the world, is the *Father*; and is also the father of *Christ*, in as much as it formed him in the womb of *Mary*. That portion, which united itself with the man *Christ*, in order to redeem men, is the *Son*; in as much as it dwelt in the *Son of God*, (a designation, which refers to his miraculous conception,) and by him gave instruction, wrought miracles, and, in a sense, made one person with him. The third portion of the divine nature, which imparts life to all living beings, enlightens men, regenerates them, and prompts them to what is good, is the *Holy Ghost*. These three are, in one view, separate from God; but in another, they are united with him.—After a critical examination of the correctness of this scheme, *Dr. Walch* can not fully accord with the views of chancellor *Mosheim*. He therefore states the doctrine of *Sabellius* thus: the ancients, one and all, say that the Sabellian system marred the true doctrine concerning God, and concerning all the three persons. And so it appears to be proved, by the ancients, that Sabellianism was one of two directly opposite errors, of which Arianism was the other; and that the true doctrine occupied the middle ground between them: indeed *Arius*, by pushing his opposition to *Sabellius* too far, was led into his error. It hence follows, that *Sabellius*, who did not deny the existence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, made too little distinction between them; while *Arius*, made the distinction too wide. It is clear, that *Sabellius* acknowledged but *one person*, and considered the Son of

must have been denominated by the ancients *Patripassians*, in a different sense of the word, from that in which the *Noëtians* were so called. Yet the appellation was not wholly improper.

§ 14. Nearly at the same time, [about AD. 244,] *Beryllus*, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, a pious and learned man, taught that *Christ*, before his birth of the virgin, had no distinct divinity, but only had the divinity of the *Father*. This proposition, if we duly

God as not being a *distinct* person : so that he could not have taught a *personal* distinction in the Trinity. By the *Word*, (λόγος,) *Sabellius* understood an *energy*, by which the man Christ performed his works. So long as Christ remained on earth, this divine energy was in him ; but afterwards it ceased. It was therefore like a sunbeam, which operates on bodies and produces the effects of the sun, without being itself a person. So also is it with the *Holy Ghost*, by which we are to understand the *operations* of God in men, tending to further their knowledge of the truth and their advancement in virtue. The manner of God's *putting forth his energy*, by which the Son was produced, and by which the Holy Ghost is still produced and continued, the ancients expressed by the words, to *spread out*, or *extend* (πλατύνεσθαι, protendere, extendere), to *send forth* (πέμπεσθαι,) and to *transform*, or *change one's form and appearance*, (μεταμορφεῖσθαι, μετασχηματίζειν). From what has now been stated, it may be perceived, how *Sabellius* could have taught the existence of three *forms* or *aspects* (τρία πρόσωπα) in the divine essence, without admitting the reality of three different *persons* ; and how his opposers could infer, that he admitted but *one distinction* under *three* different *names*. The greatest difficulty is in this, that according to some representations, *Sabellius* taught there was a *difference* or *separation* (διαίρεσιν) between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; but according to other accounts, he maintained such a *unity*, as was inconsistent with it. This difficulty is the most easily surmounted, by supposing the former to refer to an imagined or conceived distinction, and not any real one.—Such are *Dr. Walch's* views of the Sabellian system ; [and very similar are those of *Dr. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 1018—1025. Tr.] *Dr. Walch* thinks, that *Sabellius* ought not to be called a *Patripassian* : for these held Christ to be *one person*, in whom *two natures* were personally united ; and believed that, not the divine nature of the *Son*, as a person, but the divine nature of the *Father* who was the only person, was united with the human nature in Christ. Now as *Sabellius* held the *Son* to be no real *part* of the *Father*, and still less held to a *personal* union of two natures in Christ ; he can not truly be called a *Patripassian*. According to *Sabellius's* opinion, *Christ* was a *mere man*, in whom resided a *divine power*, that produced those effects which we regard as the acts of the divine nature united to the human.—Among the opposers of *Sabellius*, *Dionysius* of Alexandria attracted the most notice. Yet the opposition made by this bishop, was not satisfactory to all. Offensive passages were found in his epistles against the Sabellians. As he there brought forward the doctrine of Christ's *incarnation*, and from that deduced his proof of the real distinction between the Father and the Son ; he was understood as holding, that the *Son*, in so far as he was a divine being, was a *created* one, or as denying, that the Father and the Son were of the same essence. *Dionysius* defended himself, and showed that he had been misunderstood. Notwithstanding this, the *Arians*, after his death, claimed him as on their side ; which obliged *Athanasius* to vindicate the reputation of *Dionysius* against them. Still there continued to be some, to whom this defence appeared insufficient ; *Basil the Great*, is an example. There can be no doubt, that *Dionysius* thought with *Athanasius*, in regard to the *Trinity*, but he used the *language* of *Arius*. In regard to the *person* of *Christ*, he expressed himself in the manner of *Nestorius* ; for he carried the distinction between the divine and the human natures of Christ, so far, as wholly to exclude the former from a participation in those changes in the latter which were the result of the personal union of the two natures. See *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 50—63. Schl.]

consider what is reported concerning him by the ancients, contained the following sentiment; that *Christ* had no existence, before he was born of Mary; that at his birth, a *soul*, which originated from God himself, and was a particle of the divine nature, and therefore superior to the souls of all other men, entered and was united with the man. *Beryllus* was so lucidly and energetically confuted, by *Origen*, in a council assembled at Bostra, [AD. 244,] that he gave up the cause, and returned into the bosom of the church.(13)

§ 15. Very different from him, both in morals and in sentiment, was *Paul* of Samosata, a bishop of Antioch [in Syria,] and at the same time clothed with the civil office of a *ducenarius*.(14) He was an ostentatious man, opulent and arrogant;(15) and greatly disquieted the eastern church, soon after the middle of this century, by his novel explanations of the doctrine concerning the divine nature, and concerning *Christ*. The sect which em-

(13) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 20, and 33. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 60. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 7. Among the moderns, see *Jo. le Clerc*, Ars Critica, vol. i. Pt. ii. sec. i. c. 14. *Chaufepied*, Nouveaux Dictionnaire hist. crit. tome i. p. 268 &c. [See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c. p. 699 &c. and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 126—136.—*Dr. Walch* does not place *Beryllus* among the *heretics*; because he is not chargeable with obstinacy in his errors, nor with establishing a sect or party; both of which are necessary to constitute a heretic. Concerning his sentiments, little is known, except that he maintained that *Christ*, before his incarnation, did not exist as a divine person; but that after his incarnation, he was a man in whom *God*, namely the *Father*, dwelt.—*Dr. Mosheim's* assertion, that *Beryllus* represented *Christ* as possessing a *soul* derived from the divine essence, is a mere conjecture that can not be supported by proof. *Schl.*—*Dr. Neander*, Kirchengesch. vol. i. Pt. ii. p. 1014 &c. places *Beryllus* among that class of *Patripassians*, who considered the personality of the Son of God, as originating from a *radiation* or *emanation*, from the essence of God, into a human body. He therefore places *Beryllus* and *Sabellius* in the same class. *Tr.*]

(14) [The *ducenarii* were a species of *procurators* for the emperor, in the provinces, whose salary was *two hundred sester tia*, [*ducena sester tia*, equal to \$7193, 60], from which sum, these officers derived their title. See *Dion Cassius*, Lib. 53. *Suetonius*, Claudian c. 24. and *Salmasius*, Notes on *Capitolinus*, Pertinax, p. 125. From *Seller's* Antiquities of Palmyra, Lond. 1696. 8vo. p. 166 &c. it appears, that this office was much used in the province of Syria: and *Dr. Mosheim* conjectures, (Comment. de Rebus &c. p. 705.) that *Paul* obtained it by means of *Zenobia*, who had a high esteem of him. *Schl.*]

(15) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 30. [*Eusebius* here gives copious extracts from the circular letter of the council, which condemned *Paul*, and ordained *Domnus*, his successor. The council characterize *Paul*, as having risen from poverty to opulence, by extortion and bribery; as proud and insolent and ostentatious; as choosing to be addressed by his civil title, and appearing in public attended by guards and all the splendor of worldly rank; as affecting splendor and power, and abusing authority as an officer in the church; as intolerably vain, and coveting the adulations of the multitude; as decrying the fathers of the church, exalting himself, and abolishing the hymns in common use, and appointing women to sing psalms in praise of himself; as sending out bishops and presbyters to sound his praise, and to extol him as an angel from heaven; as keeping several young and handsome women near his person, whom he enriched with presents, and as living in luxury with them.—How much of coloring there may be in this picture, we have not the means of determining. But there can be little doubt, the character of *Paul* was such as did not become a bishop. *Tr.*]

braced his opinions, were called *Paulians* or *Paulianists*. So far as can be judged from the accounts that have reached us, he supposed the Son and the Holy Spirit to exist in God, just as reason and the operative power do in man; that *Christ* was born a mere man; but that the *wisdom* or *reason* (λόγος) of the Father descended into him, and enabled him to teach and to work miracles; that on account of this union of the divine Word (λόγος) with the man *Christ*, we might say, *Christ* was *God*, though not in the proper sense of the word. He so concealed his real sentiments under ambiguous forms of speech, that repeated ecclesiastical councils were wholly unable to convict him: but at last, in the council assembled A.D. 269, *Malchion*, a rhetorician, drew him from his concealment; and he was convicted, and divested of his episcopal office.(16)

§ 16. In a very different way, some little philosophers in Arabia, the disciples of a man unknown, marred a part of the christian system. They denied the soul to be *immortal*; maintaining that it died with the body, and that it would be resuscitated with it by the power of God.(17) The believers in this doctrine were

(16) See *Epistolam Concilii Antiocheni ad Paulum*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. xi. p. 302. ed. Paris, 1644, Fol. and *Dionysii Alexandrini Ep. ad Paulum*, *ibid.* p. 273. and, *Decem Pauli Samosatani Quaestiones*, *ibid.* p. 278.—[See also *Dr. Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c.* p. 701—718. and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 64—125. From the last writer, we extract the following, to give a more full and correct view of the Samosatene doctrines. 1. *Paul* of Samosata taught, that there is but *one* God, who, in the scriptures is denominated *the Father*. 2. He did not deny, that the scriptures *speak of* the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 3. What he understood by the *Holy Ghost*, we do not know; and *Dr. Mosheim* has attempted to supply this defect, by a mere conjecture. 4. Concerning the *Word* and the *Wisdom* of God, he has spoken largely: but whether he distinguished between the *Word in God* (λόγος ἐνδι-άθετος) and the *Word produced from God* (λόγος προφορικός,) is doubtful. 5. This *Word* or *Wisdom* in God, is not a substance or a *person*. 6. But it is in the divine mind, as reason is in men. 7. *Christ* was a *mere man*. 8. He first began to exist, when he was born of Mary. 9. Yet in this man, dwelt the divine *Word* or *Wisdom*; and it was operative in him. 10. The union commenced, when *Christ* was conceived in the womb of Mary. 11. By means of this *Wisdom* of God in him, *Christ* gradually acquired his knowledge and his practical virtues. By it, he became at once *God* and the *Son of God*; yet both, in an improper sense of the terms.—From this account it appears, that *Photian*, in the next age, came very near to *Paul* of Samosata, not indeed in his statements and expressions, but rather in his grand error, namely that *Christ* was a mere man, and superior to other men only on account of his preeminent gifts. *Schl.*]

(17) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. vi. c. 37. [See *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c.* p. 718. and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 167—171.—As *Eusebius*, who is the only witness we have in regard to this sect, gives a very brief account of them, the learned in modern times have entertained two opinions concerning their system. Some suppose, they held that the soul, though immaterial, *sleeps* while the body is in the grave: which however, the words of *Eusebius* seem to contradict, for they describe the soul as *dying*, and *being dissolved, with the body*, συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώμασι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσθαι. Others suppose, more correctly, that they were christian *materialists*, who regarded the soul as being a *part of the body*. And *Dr. Mosheim* conjectures, that their error originated from their combining the Epicurean philosophy with christianity. *Schl.*]

called *Arabians*, from the country in which they lived. Against them, *Origen*, being sent for from Egypt, disputed with such success, in a full council, that they renounced their error.

§ 17. Among the sects which arose in this century, that of the *Novatians* is placed last. They did not indeed corrupt the doctrines of christianity, but by the severity of the discipline to which they adhered, they produced a lamentable schism. *Novatian*,⁽¹⁸⁾ a presbyter in the church of Rome, a man of learning and eloquence, but of a stern and austere character,⁽¹⁹⁾ maintained, that such as had fallen into the more heinous sins, and especially such as had denied *Christ* during the Decian persecution, ought never to be admitted again to the church. Most of the other presbyters, as well as *Cornelius* whose influence was very great, were of a different opinion. Hence, in the year 250, when a new bishop was to be chosen at Rome, in place of *Fabian*, *Novatian* strenuously opposed the election of *Cornelius*. Yet *Cornelius* was chosen, and *Novatian* withdrew from communion with him. On the other hand, *Cornelius*, in a council held at Rome AD. 251, excommunicated *Novatian* and his adherents. *Novatian* therefore founded a new sect, in which he was the first bishop. This sect had many adherents, who were pleased with the severity of its discipline; and it continued to flourish in many parts of christendom, until the *fifth* century. The principal coadjutor of *Novatian* in this schism, was *Novatus*, a presbyter of Carthage, who fled to Rome, during the heat of this controversy, in order to escape the wrath and the condemnation of *Cyprian* his bishop, with whom he was in a violent quarrel.⁽²⁰⁾

(18) [The Greeks always write his name *Novatus*, or *Navatus*: but the Latins generally write it *Novatianus*; perhaps, to distinguish him from *Novatus* of Carthage, the names being really the same. Tr.]

(19) [These traits of character, he perhaps owed to the Stoic philosophy, to which some have supposed him addicted. See *Walch*, l. c. p. 195. Schl.]

(20) [*Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 220 &c. after surveying the original accounts, gives the following connected view of these events. A great number of those, who in the Decian persecution had fallen from their steadfastness, having afterwards repented of their fall, and sought to be admitted again to the communion of the church, gave rise to the question of conscience, how they ought to be treated. The episcopal chair at Rome was at that time vacant, in consequence of the death of *Fabian*; and the clergy were divided in regard to this question, some advocating mild, and others more rigorous measures. Among the latter was *Novatian*, among the former *Cornelius*; both of them elders in the church of Rome. On the side of *Novatian* were several confessors; that is, persons who had endured various corporeal punishments, during the persecution, without denying the faith; and these were haughty and overbearing towards their fallen brethren. While this subject was in agitation at Rome, news came from Carthage, that the lapsed there would be received again, but only after enduring a long penance; though, if in imminent danger of death, and they desired it, they might be reunited to the church. And these principles were approved at Rome, in an epistle composed by *Novatian*, (inter *Epistolas Cypr.* Ep. 31.) Now came on the election of a bishop of Rome; and here the two parties were divided. *Novatian* solemnly declared, that he did not desire the office; and

§ 18. Respecting the fundamental articles of the christian faith, there was no disagreement between the *Novatians* and other

Cornelius was chosen by a majority of the votes. But as *Cornelius* was one of the milder party, not only *Novatian*, but also the confessors, and several of the elders, were dissatisfied with his election ; and, it would seem, separated themselves from him. About this time *Novatus* arrived from Carthage. He had fallen out with *Cyprian*, his bishop ; and perhaps knew, that *Cyprian* was a friend of *Cornelius* ; but the former did not commit himself. *Cornelius* acquainted *Cyprian* with his election. Information had already reached Carthage, that *Cornelius* was not approved by all at Rome ; and *Cyprian* did not venture at once to declare in his favor, but sent two African bishops, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, to Rome, with a letter addressed, not to *Cornelius* as bishop, but to the clergy there, and to the neighboring bishops who were present at the election. The *Cornelian* party again stated, that his election was regular ; and the African envoys, with two envoys from Rome who accompanied them home, affirmed the same thing. Hereupon *Cornelius* was recognized at Carthage, as being the bishop of Rome. But at Rome the business was not so easily settled. The dissatisfied party urged on a new election ; and *Novatus* and *Evaristus* were the most suitable persons to persuade *Novatian* to consent to receive ordination. As at least three bishops must impose hands on a bishop-elect, three such clergymen were drawn from some small towns in Italy, and by deception induced to perform this act. The ordination was also performed at an unusual hour. *Novatian* appears to have reluctantly consented to it ; but he afterwards endeavored to support himself in office. He sent letters every where, and twice despatched envoys to Africa. These could get no hearing from *Cyprian* and his adherents ; yet their mission was not without effect. In other countries likewise, he found persons, who considered his dissatisfaction with *Cornelius* and with his conduct towards the lapsed, as being well founded. In the mean time *Cornelius* held a council at Rome, which approved of the milder principles of discipline. *Novatian* was present, and resisted those principles before the council ; but he was excommunicated by it, together with his adherents. This caused his party to diminish, many of his friends choosing rather to be on the strongest side : and hence he was induced, when administering the sacrament of the supper to his followers, to make them promise not to forsake him. *Schl.*—As the dissensions at Carthage about the same time, had some connexion with those at Rome, and also tend to shew the state of the church in the middle of this century ; the following account of them is extracted from *Mosheim's* Comment. de Rebus &c. § xiii. p. 497 &c. and § xiv. p. 503 &c. *Novatus*, a presbyter at Carthage, even before the Decian persecution, had disagreed with *Cyprian* his bishop, and formed a party who were dissatisfied with him, and who would not yield to all his wishes. According to the representations of his adversaries, *Novatus* was not only arrogant, factious, vain, and rash, but chargeable with many offences and crimes. *Cyprian* therefore resolved to bring him to a trial, and to excommunicate him. The day for trial was appointed ; but the imperial edict [for the persecution] unexpectedly intervened ; and as *Cyprian* was obliged to retire into concealment, *Novatus* continued safe in his office. This was the first act in the long tragedy. While *Cyprian* was in retirement, and the African magistrates fiercely persecuting the christians, these contests were suspended. But when the violence of the storm from without was past, and *Cyprian* was preparing to return to his church, *Novatus* fearing, no doubt, that the bishop would renew the prosecution against him, which was commenced before his retirement, deemed it necessary to raise a party against the bishop, which should prevent his returning to his church, and thus deprive him of the power of doing him harm. By means of *Felicissimus*, therefore, whom he had made his deacon, contrary to the will of the bishop, *Novatus* alienated a part of the church from *Cyprian*. *Felicissimus*, aided by one *Augendus*, prevented the execution of the plans of the bishop in regard to the poor. Many of the people came over to his party ; and also five presbyters, who had long been at variance with *Cyprian*. This turbulent party were able to retard a little, but not to prevent the return of *Cyprian*. After some delay, which prudence dictated, the bishop returned to Carthage ; and having assembled a council on the subject, especially of the lapsed, he punished the temerity of his adversaries, and excommunicated *Felicissimus*, the author of the re-

christians. Their peculiarity was, that they would not receive into the church persons, who, after being baptized, fell into the greater sins. They did not however exclude them from all hopes of eternal salvation. They considered the christian church, therefore, as a society of innocent persons, who, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with no sin of any considerable magnitude; and hence it followed, that all associations of christians, which opened the door for the return of gross offenders, were in their view unworthy of the name of true churches of Christ. And hence they assumed the appellation of *Cathari*, that is, the *pure*; and what was still more, they re-baptized such as came over to them from the catholics. For, such influence had the error they embraced upon their own minds, that they believed the baptism of those churches which re-admitted the lapsed, could not impart to the subjects of it remission of sins.(21)

volt, together with the five presbyters his associates. *Novatus* was not of the number, as he was absent, having fled to Rome, as soon as he found *Cyprian* would come to Carthage. The excommunicated persons, despising the censure passed on them, instituted a new church at Carthage, in opposition to that of *Cyprian*, and established as the bishop of it, *Fortunatus*, one of the presbyters whom *Cyprian* had condemned. But the party had more resolution than ability, and the schism was probably extinguished not long after its birth; for no mention is made of its progress by any of the fathers. *Tr.*]

(21) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vi. c. 43. *Cyprian*, in various of his Epistles, as Ep. 49, 52. &c. *Gabr. Alaspinaeus*, Observat. Eccles. Lib. ii. c. 20, 21. *Jos. Aug. Orsi*, de criminum capital. inter veteres Christ. Absolutione, p. 254 &c. *Steph. Kenckel*, de haeresi Novatiana, Argentor. 1651. 4to. [also, *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c. p. 512—537. and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzeren, vol. ii. p. 185—288. *Schl.*]

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.
BOOK II.
EMBRACING
EVENTS, FROM CONSTANTINE THE GREAT,
TO
CHARLEMAGNE.

CENTURY FOURTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH: EXHIBITING BOTH THE PROSPEROUS AND THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF IT.

§ 1. Peaceful state of christians at the beginning of the century.—§ 2. Persecution of Diocletian.—§ 3. The causes and the severity of it.—§ 4. The christian cause reduced to great extremities.—§ 5. Tranquillity restored on the accession of Constantine to supreme power.—§ 6. Defeat of Maxentius.—§ 7, 8. Different opinions concerning the faith of Constantine.—§ 9. The cross seen by him in the heavens.—§ 10. Persecution of Licinius.—§ 11. State of the church under the sons of Constantine the Great.—§ 12. Julian persecutes the christians.—§ 13. His character.—§ 14. The Jews attempt to rebuild their temple in vain.—§ 15. State of the church after the death of Julian.—§ 16. Remains of the pagans.—§ 17. Efforts of the philosophers against christianity.—§ 18. Injuries it received from them.—§ 19. Propagation of christianity among the Armenians.—§ 20. The Abyssinians and Georgians.—§ 21. The Goths.—§ 22. The Gauls.—§ 23. The causes of so many revolutions.—§ 24. Severe persecutions in Persia.

§ 1. That I might not separate too much those facts which are intimately connected with each other, I have determined here to exhibit the prosperous and the adverse events, not in distinct chapters, as heretofore, but combined in one series, following as much as possible the order of time.—In the beginning of this century, the Roman empire had four sovereigns; of whom two were superior to the others, and bore the title of *Augustus*, namely, [*Valerius*] *Diocletian*, and [*Marcus Aurelius Valerius*] *Maximianus Hercules*: the two inferior sovereigns, who bore the title of *Caesars*, were *Constantius Chlorus*, and *Galerius Maximianus* [*Armentarius*.] Under these four [associated] emperors, the state of the church was peaceful and happy.(1) *Dio-*

(1) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. viii. c. 1. [*Eusebius* here describes the prosperous state of the christians, and their consequent security and vices. The imperial palaces were full of christians, and no one hindered them from openly professing christianity. From among them, men were chosen to the offices of imperial counsellors, provincial governors, magistrates and generals. The bishops and other clergy were held in honor, even by those who adhered to the old religion of the state. And the number of christians was seen to be increasing daily. Hence in all the cities, spacious buildings were erected for public worship, in which the people assembled without fear: and they had nothing to wish for, unless it were that one or more of the emperors might embrace their religion. *Schl.*]

cletian, though superstitious, indulged no hatred towards the christians.(2) *Constantius Chlorus*, following only the dictates of reason in matters of religion, was averse from the popular idolatry, and friendly to the christians.(3) The pagan priests therefore, from well grounded fears, lest christianity, to their great and lasting injury, should spread far and wide its triumphs, endeavored to excite *Diocletian*, whom they knew to be both timid and credulous, by means of feigned oracles and other impositions, to engage in persecuting the christians.(4)

§ 2. These artifices not succeeding very well, they made use of the other emperor, *Galerius Maximianus*, who was son-in-law to *Diocletian*, in order to effect their purpose. This emperor, who was of a ferocious character, and ill-informed in every thing except the military art, continued to work upon his father-in-law, being urged on partly by his own inclination, partly by the instigation of his mother, a most superstitious woman, and partly by that of the pagan priests, till at last, when *Diocletian* was at Nicomedia, in the year 303, he obtained from him an edict, by which the temples of the christians were to be demolished, their sacred books committed to the flames, and themselves deprived of all their civil rights and honors.(5) This first edict

(2) [He had christians in his court, who understood how to lead him, and who would probably have brought him to renounce idolatry, had not the suggestions of their enemies prevailed with him. His wife *Prisca* was, in reality, a concealed christian; and also his daughter *Valeria*, the wife of *Galerius Maximianus*. See *Lactantius*, de Mortibus Persecutorum, c. 15. Schl.]

(3) [Some go still farther, and make him to have been actually a christian. But from the representations of *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. viii. c. 13. no more can be inferred than, that he was disposed to look favorably upon the christian religion. Schl.]

(4) *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, Lib. ii. c. 50. *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinar. Lib. iv. c. 27. and de Mortibus Persecutor. c. 10. [According to *Eusebius*, l. c. it was reported to the emperor, that the oracle of *Apollo* had declared, he was prevented from giving true responses by the righteous men on the earth; and this the pagan priests interpreted, when questioned by the emperor, with reference to the christians. According to *Lactantius*, ubi supra, while *Diocletian* was at Antioch, in the year 302, the priests who inspected the entrails of the consecrated victims, declared, that they were interrupted in their prognostications by the sign of the cross made by several of the emperor's servants. Schl.]

(5) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persecutor. c. 11. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 2. [This persecution should, properly, be named that of *Galerius Maximianus*, and not, that of *Diocletian*. For *Diocletian* had much the least hand in it; and he resigned his authority, before the persecution had continued quite two years: moreover *Maximianus*, in his edict for putting an end to the persecution, a little before his death, acknowledges, that he himself was the author of it. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. viii. 17. and *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persecutor. c. 34. *Romula*, the mother of *Galerius*, who was a very superstitious and haughty woman, and who was offended that the christians would not allow her to be present when they celebrated the Lord's supper, contributed to inflame the rage of her son against them. Perhaps also the Platonic philosophers had some influence in exciting the emperor's hostility; for they represented the many sects among the christians in a most odious light, and taxed them with having apostatized from the religion of the early christians. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. viii. c. 17. But political considerations may have influenced him. *Galerius* contemplated getting rid of his colleagues, and making himself sole emperor. The christians who

spared the lives of the christians ; for *Diocletian* was averse from slaughter and blood-shed. Yet it caused many christians to be put to death, particularly those who refused to deliver up their sacred books to the magistrates.(6) Seeing this operation of the law, many christians, and several even of the bishops and clergy, in order to save their lives, voluntarily surrendered the sacred books in their possession. But they were regarded by their more resolute brethren as guilty of sacrilege, and were branded with the name of *Traditors*.(7)

§ 3. Not long after the publication of this first edict, there were two conflagrations in the palace of Nicomedia ; and the enemies of the christians persuaded *Diocletian* to believe, that christian hands had kindled them. He therefore ordered many christians of Nicomedia to be put to the torture, and to undergo the penalties due to incendiaries.(8) Nearly at the same time, there were insurrections in Armenia and in Syria ; and as their enemies charged the blame of these also upon the christians, the emperor by a *new* edict ordered all bishops and ministers of Christ to be thrown into prison ; and by a *third* edict, soon after, he ordered that all these prisoners should be compelled by tortures and punishments to offer sacrifice to the gods : (9) for he hoped, if the

were attached to *Constantius Chlorus* and his son, seemed to him to stand in the way of his designs ; and he wished to weaken their power, or rather to annihilate it, as far as practicable. But *Diocletian* was not disposed to further his cruel project. He was willing to exclude christians from the palace and the army, and to compel all who served him at court or in the armies, to offer sacrifices to the gods ; but not to suspend over them penal laws and executions. *Galerius* would have them all brought to the stake. A council was called, composed of learned civilians and officers in the army, which declared against the christians. To this decision, *Hierocles*, the governor of Bithynia, and one who afterwards wrote against the christians, contributed not a little. But *Diocletian* would not yet give up entirely. He would consult the oracle of Apollo at Miletus ; which likewise directed to the extirpation of the christians. But even Apollo could not move the superstitious emperor to the extreme of cruelty. He decreed indeed a persecution ; but it was to cost no blood. It commenced with the demolition of the christian temple at Nicomedia, and the burning of the books found in it. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c. p. 916—922. *Schl.*]

(6) *Augustine*, Breviculus collat. cum Donatistis, c. 15, 17. in his Opp. tom. ix. p. 387, 390. and *Baluze*, Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 77, 92.

(7) *Optatus Milevit.* de Schismate Donatist. L. i. § 13. p. 13. ed. du Pin.

(8) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 6. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 14. *Constantine* the Gr. Oratio ad Sanctorum coetum, c. 25.—[After the second conflagration, *Galerius* left Nicomedia, pretending to be afraid of being burnt up by the christians. *Diocletian* also compelled his wife and daughter to sacrifice to the gods, in proof that they were not christians ; and caused many christians of his household and court to be cut off, and *Lonthimus* the bishop of Nicomedia, with many of the clergy and common christians, to undergo cruel deaths, because they refused to offer sacrifices to the gods. *Schl.*]

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 6. and de Martyribus Palaestinae, [Introduction.]—[Some degree of probability could be attached to the charge against the christians, causing the insurrections, from the fact that their inconsiderate zeal sometimes led them to deeds which had an aspect of rebellion. At the commencement of this persecution, for example, a very respectable christian tore down the imperial edict against the christians, which was set up in a public place. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 5. *Schl.*]

bishops and teachers were once brought to submission, the christian churches would follow their example. A great multitude therefore, of excellent men, in every part of the Roman empire, Gaul only excepted, which was subject to *Constantius Chlorus*, (10) were either punished capitally, or condemned to the mines.

§ 4. In the second year of the persecution, AD. 304, *Diocletian* published a *fourth* edict, at the instigation of his son-in-law and the other enemies of the christians. By this edict the magistrates were directed, to compel all christians to offer sacrifices to the gods, and to use tortures for that purpose. (11) And as the governors yielded strict obedience to these orders, the christian church was reduced to the last extremity. (12) *Galerius Maximianus* therefore no longer hesitated to disclose the secret designs he had long entertained. [AD. 305.] He required his father-in-

(10) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequentorum, c. 15. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 13, 18.—[*Constantius Chlorus* presided over Spain and Britain, as well as Gaul. In Spain there were some martyrs; because *Constantius* not being present there in person, he could not prevent the rigorous execution of the decree of the senior emperor. But in Gaul, where he was personally present, he favored the christians, as much as sound policy would permit. He suffered some of the churches to be demolished, and most of them to be shut up. And when the last edict of *Galerius* against the christians was promulgated, he enjoined upon all his christian servants, to relinquish either their mode of worship or their offices; and when they had made their election, he deprived all those of their offices who resolved to adhere to christian worship, and retained the others in his service. Schl.]

(11) *Eusebius*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 3.—[*Diocletian* was not yet willing the christians should be put to death outright; his orders to the governors were couched in general terms, that they should compel the christians, by all kinds of corporeal sufferings, to give honor to the heathen gods. See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, L. ii. c. 51. compare *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar. L. v. c. 11. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. ix. c. 9. and L. viii. c. 12. Hence, according with the disposition of the several governors, was their execution of the imperial edict. Some only sent the christians into banishment, when the attempt to make them offer sacrifices failed. Others deprived them of an eye, or lamed one of their feet by burning it: and others exposed them to wild beasts; or lacerated their bodies with iron hooks or with the scourge; and afterwards sprinkled vinegar and salt on the wounds, or dropped melted lead into them. In Phrygia, a whole city with all its inhabitants was burnt to ashes, because not an individual in it would offer sacrifice. *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar. Lib. v. c. 11. Some christians also brought death upon themselves, by holding religious meetings contrary to the emperor's prohibition, or by voluntarily presenting themselves before the governors and requesting to be martyred. *Sulpitius Severus*, Hist. Sacra, Lib. ii. c. 32. and *Eusebius*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 3. Schl.]

(12) *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar. L. v. c. 11.—[With the exception of Gaul, streams of christian blood flowed in all the provinces of the Roman empire. Every where the christian temples lay in ruins, and all assemblies for worship were suspended. The major part had forsaken the provinces, and taken refuge among the barbarians. Such as were unable or unwilling to do this, kept themselves concealed, and were afraid for their lives if they appeared in public. The ministers of Christ were either slain, or mutilated and sent to the mines, or banished the country. The avaricious magistrates and judges had seized upon nearly all their church property and their private possessions. Many, through dread of undergoing torture, had made away with their own lives, and many had apostatized from the faith; and what remained of the christian community, consisted of a few weak, poor, and timorous persons. Schl.]

law, [*Diocletian*,] together with his colleague, [*Valerius*] *Maximianus Herculus*, to divest themselves of their power, and constituted himself emperor of the East ; leaving the West to *Constantius Chlorus*, whose health he knew to be very infirm. He also associated with him in the government, two assistants, of his own choosing ; namely, [*C. Galerius*] *Maximinus*, his sister's son, and [*Flavius*] *Severus* ; excluding altogether *Constantine*, afterwards styled *the Great*, the son of *Constantius Chlorus*.(13) This revolution in the Roman government restored peace to christians in the western provinces, which were under *Constantius* : (14) but in the eastern provinces, the persecution raged with greater severity than before. (15)

§ 5. But divine providence frustrated the whole plan of *Galerius Maximianus*. For, *Constantius Chlorus* dying in Britain, in the year 306, the soldiery by acclamation made his son *Constantine*, who afterwards by his achievements obtained the title of *the Great*, Augustus or emperor : and the tyrant *Galerius* was obliged to submit, and even to approve this adverse event. Soon after, a civil war broke out. For, *Maxentius*, [the son of the ex-emperor, *Valerius Maximianus Herculus*, and] the son-in-law of *Galerius Maximianus*, being indignant that *Galerius* should prefer *Severus* before him, and invest him with imperial power, himself assumed the purple ; and took his father, *Valer. Maxim. Herculus* for his colleague in the empire. In the midst of these commotions, *Constantine*, beyond all expectation, made

(13) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 18, 20.—[*Galerius Maximianus* was in more fear of the young prince *Constantine*, than of his father *Constantius* ; the latter being a mild and sickly sovereign, while *Constantine* was of an ardent temperament, and at the same time greatly beloved by the people and the soldiers. Yet *Galerius* had this prince in his power ; for he detained him at his court in Nicomedia, and if he found occasion, might have put him out of his way by assassination or some other means. Indeed *Galerius* attempted this, especially in the year 306. *Lactantius* de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 24. But *Constantine* saved himself by flight, and repaired to his father in Britain. This sagacity of the prince overset the whole plan of the emperor, and was the means of rescuing the christian religion from its jeopardy. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. &c. p. 942 &c. Schl.]

(14) *Eusebius*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 13.—[*Eusebius* says expressly that Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Spain, Mauritania and Africa, enjoyed peace, after the two first years of the persecution. Nor was this strange ; for *Constantius Chlorus*, who governed Britain, Spain, and Gaul, was a friend to the christians ; and *Severus*, who in the character of a Caesar, held the other western provinces, was obliged to shew deference to *Constantius* as the emperor of the West. Neither was the debauched *Severus*, of himself, inclined to cruelty. Yet the christians enjoyed less freedom under him, than under *Constantius*. See *Optatus Milevitanus*, de Schismate Donatist. L. i. c. 14. comp. c. 16. Schl.]

(15) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 21.—[*Lactantius* here states, that *Galerius Maximianus* gave orders, that such christians as could not by tortures be induced to sacrifice, should be roasted over a slow fire. *Maximin*, who governed Syria and Egypt, at first shewed himself quite mild towards the christians. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. ix. c. 9. But afterwards, he seemed to wish to surpass all other enemies of the christians, in cruelty towards them. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. &c. p. 945 &c. Schl.]

his way to the imperial throne. The western christians, those of Italy and Africa excepted, enjoyed a good degree of tranquillity and liberty, during these civil wars.(16) But the oriental churches experienced various fortune, adverse, or tolerable, according to the political changes from year to year.(17) At length *Galerius Maximianus*, who had been the author of their heaviest calamities, being brought low by a terrific and protracted disease, and finding himself ready to die, in the year 311, issued a decree which restored peace to them, after they had endured almost unbounded sufferings.(18)

§ 6. After the death of *Galerius Maximianus*, [AD. 311.] *C. Galerius Maximinus* and *C. Val. Licinius*, [who was created Augustus by *Galerius Maximianus*, after the death of *Flavius Severus*, AD. 307,] divided between themselves the provinces which had been governed by *Galerius*. At the same time *Maxentius*, who held Africa and Italy, determined to make war upon *Constantine* who governed in Spain and Gaul; in order to bring all the West under his authority. *Constantine* anticipated

(16) [*Constantine*, as soon as he came into power, gave the christians full liberty to profess and to practise their religion. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 24. and Institut. Divinor. L. i. c. 1. This he did, not from a sense of justice, or from magnanimity, and still less from any attachment to the christian religion, but from principles of worldly prudence. He wished to attach the christians to his party, that they might protect him against the power and the machinations of *Galerius Maximian*. His brother-in-law, *Maxentius*, imitated his example, and with similar views; and therefore the christians under him in Africa and Italy, enjoyed entire religious liberty. See *Optatus Milevitanus*, de Schismate Donatist. L. i. c. 16. and *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 14. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. Christian. p. 952 &c. Schl.]

(17) [In the eastern provinces, which were under the government of *Galerius Maximianus* and *C. Galerius Maximinus*, christians were the most cruelly persecuted; as is manifest from various passages in *Eusebius*. Yet *C. G. Maximin* did not at all times treat them with equal severity. According to *Euseb.* (de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 9.) in the year 308, the persecution seemed to be at an end in Syria and Palestine: but it soon after recommenced, with increased severity. The cause of these vicissitudes is to be sought in the political state of things. In this year, *C. G. Maximin* assumed the title of *Cæsar* in Syria, against the will of *Galerius Maximianus*; and the latter appeared about to declare war against the former; who therefore was indulgent towards the christians, in order to secure their friendship. But as *Galerius Maximianus* was appeased, *C. G. Maximin* became more severe against the christians, in order to ingratiate himself more effectually with the emperor. After a while, however, he abated his severity; and towards the end of the year 309 and in the beginning of 310, the christians enjoyed great freedom: (*Euseb.* de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 13.) for *Galerius Maximianus* was now in declining health, and in such circumstances, *C. G. Maximin* wished not to alienate the christians from himself. Yet when the governor of the province informed him, in the year 310, that the christians abused their freedom, *Maximin* renewed the persecution. But soon after *Galerius Maximianus* was seized with his last and fatal sickness, and *C. G. Maximin* being apprehensive that the imperial power could be secured only by a successful appeal to arms, policy required him again to desist from persecuting the christians. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 16. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. Christianor. p. 955 &c. Schl.]

(18) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 16. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 33.—[The decree is given us, in Greek, by *Euseb.* Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c. 17. and in Latin, by *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 34. Schl.]

his designs, marched his army into Italy in the year 312, and in a battle fought at the Milvian bridge near Rome, routed the army of *Maxentius*. In the flight, the bridge broke down, and *Maxentius* fell into the Tiber, and was drowned. After this victory, *Constantine*, with his colleague *C. Val. Licinius*, immediately gave full liberty to the christians of living according to their own institutions and laws; and this liberty was more clearly defined, the following year, AD. 313. in a new edict drawn up at Milan.⁽¹⁹⁾ *C. Gal. Maximin*, indeed, who reigned in the East, was projecting new calamities for the christians,⁽²⁰⁾ and menacing the emperors of the West with war; but being vanquished by *Licinius*, he put an end to his own life by swallowing poison, at Tarsus, in the year 313.

§ 7. About this time, *Constantine* the Great, who was previously a man of no religion, is said to have embraced christianity, being induced thereto, principally, by the miracle of a cross ap-

(19) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. x. c. 5. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persecutor. c. 48. [It is the second edict, or that of Milan, which is found in the passages here referred to: *Eusebius* gives it in Greek, *Lactantius* in Latin. The first edict is wholly lost; yet from the second, we may learn what was obscure or indefinite in the first. The first edict gave religious freedom, not only to the christians, but to all other sects; yet it forbid any person's abandoning the religion in which he had been born and brought up. This prohibition operated disadvantageously to the christian cause; and occasioned many, who had recently embraced christianity, to return to their former religion, in obedience to the imperial edict. This prohibition therefore, with all other restraints, was removed in the second edict. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. p. 959. *Schl.*]

(20) [*C. Gal. Maximin* did not at first venture to contravene the edict of *Gal. Maximianus*, (giving full toleration to the christians,) yet he did not publish it in his provinces; but afterwards, by underhanded evasions, he violated it. For, if we may believe *Lactantius*, (de Mortib. Persecutor. c. 36.) he slyly so managed, that what some cities petitioned for, namely that the christians might be prevented from erecting temples within their walls, was effected. *Eusebius* relates, (Hist. Eccles. L. x. c. 2.) that through the medium of one *Theotecnus*, he induced the Antiochians to petition to him, that no christian might be allowed to reside in their city; and then granted them their petition. Other cities followed this example, and thus a new persecution was set on foot. Perhaps *Lactantius* and *Eusebius* erred, in representing *Maximin* as the original cause of these applications to himself. Such petitions were in fact presented; and as the emperor was about engaging in war with *Constantine*, he used every means to secure the fidelity of cities in the East to himself; and as the persecution of the christians was one of the means to be used, therefore he gratified their wishes. Subsequently, when the first edict of *Constantine* and *Licinius* was brought to him, in the year 312, he would not suffer it to be published in his provinces; probably from pride, he deeming it unsuitable, for him to be the publisher of edicts given out by persons whom he regarded as his inferiors in rank. Yet, according to *Eusebius*, (Hist. Eccles. L. ix. c. 9.) he sent a letter to his governors of provinces, which was very favorable to the christians, and in which he requested his subjects to treat them kindly and tenderly. The christians however, put no confidence in this letter, but were still afraid openly to profess their religion. But after he had been vanquished by *Licinius*, in the year 313, he published a new edict in favor of the christians; (*Euseb.* Hist. Eccles. L. ix. c. 10.) in which he laments, that the judges and magistrates had misinterpreted the former law; and he now expressly gives the christians liberty to rebuild their temples, and commands that the property taken from them should be restored. Soon after this, he died; and the ten years' persecution ended. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. p. 961 &c. *Schl.*]

pearing to him in the heavens. But this story is liable to much doubt. For his first edict in favor of the christians, and many other things, sufficiently evince, that he was indeed at that time well disposed towards the christians and their worship, but that he by no means regarded christianity as the only true and saving religion; on the contrary, it appears, that he regarded other religions, and among them the old Roman religion, as likewise true, and useful to mankind; and he therefore wished all religions to be freely practised throughout the Roman empire.(21) But as he advanced in life, *Constantine* made progress in religious knowledge, and gradually came to regard christianity as the only true and saving religion, and to consider all others as false and impious. Having learned this, he now began to exhort his subjects to embrace christianity; and at length he proclaimed war against the ancient superstitions. At what time this change in the views of the emperor took place, and he began to look upon all religions but the christian as false, can not be determined. This however is certain, that the change in his views was first made manifest by his laws and edicts, in the year 324, after the death of *Licinius*, when *Constantine* became sole emperor.(22) His purpose however, of abolishing the ancient religion of the Romans, and of tolerating only the christian religion, he did not disclose till a little before his death, when he published his edicts for pulling down the pagan temples and abolishing the sacrifices.(23)

(21) [This is evident from *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, L. i. c. 27. In the commencement of the war with *Maxentius*, he was still at a loss, to what God he should trust himself and his affairs. He at length determined to honor that one God only, whom his father had worshipped, and to show no reverence to the ancient Roman deities. The grounds, on which he came to this decision, were feeble: namely, the good fortune of his father, who adhered to this worship; and the ill fortune and lamentable end of *Diocletian*, *Galerius Maximian*, and other emperors, who had worshipped the pagan deities. And, according to *Eusebius*, (de Vita Constantini L. i. c. 28.) he knew so little of the God of his father, that he prayed he might be able to know him. He was a *deist* of the lowest class, who considered the God of his father as a limited being, though more benevolent and powerful than any of the Greek and Roman deities. This is manifest from his regulations in favor of the christians, and from his laws tolerating the pagan *haruspices*. Codex Theodos. L. ix. Tit. 16. Leg. 1, 2. and L. xvi. Tit. 10. Leg. i. Compare *Zosimus*, Lib. ii. p. 10. ed. Oxford, 1679. 8vo. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. p. 971 &c *Schl.*]

(22) *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, L. ii. c. 20 and 44. [In this year, 324, all those who, for their adherence to christianity during the preceding persecution, had become exiles, or been sent to the mines, or been robbed of their property, were restored to their country, their liberty, and their possessions; and the christian temples were ordered to be rebuilt and enlarged. *Schl.*]

(23) See *Ja. Godfrey*, ad Codicem Theodos. Tom. vi. Pt. i. p. 290 &c. [The statement of *Zosimus* (Lib. ii. p. 104.) is not to be wholly rejected. He says, that after the death of *Licinius*, a certain Egyptian came to Rome from Spain, and convinced the emperor of the truth of the christian religion. No reason can be assigned, why *Zosimus* should have fabricated such a story. This Egyptian was probably *Hosius*, the bishop of Corduba; who was a native Egyptian, and was then at the court of *Constantine*, very probably, soliciting the restoration of

§ 8. That the emperor was sincere, and not a dissembler, in regard to his conversion to christianity, no person can doubt, who believes that men's actions are an index of their real feelings. It is indeed true, that *Constantine's* life was not such as the precepts of christianity required ;(24) and it is also true, that he remained a *catechumen* all his life, and was received to full membership in the church, by baptism, only a few days before his death, at Nicomedia.(25) But neither of these is adequate proof, that the emperor had not a general conviction of the truth of the

the church goods which had been confiscated. At least, it is expressly stated, that the money destined for Africa, was paid in consequence of his efforts. This conjecture is favored by *Baumgarten*, *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. p. 691. The later Greeks ascribe the emperor's conversion to a courtier named *Euphrates* ; of whom however, the ancients make no mention. *Theodoret*, (*Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 17.) ascribes it to the influence of *Helena* his mother ; but, she was brought to embrace christianity by her son, according to *Eusebius*, *de Vita Constantini*, L. iii. c. 47.—*Zosimus* relates, further, that *Constantine* asked the pagan priests to absolve him from the guilt of destroying *Licinius*, *Fausta*, and *Crispus* ; and when they told him, this was impossible, the Egyptian before mentioned, undertook to show, that the christian religion offered the means of cleansing away his guilt ; and this it was, induced the emperor to embrace christianity. There is perhaps some degree of truth in this story ; perhaps *Constantine* did, in fact, after the death of *Licinius*, first learn, either from this Egyptian, or from some others, that the blood of *Christ* was expiatory for believers therein. It is at least certain, that in the first years after his victory over *Maxentius*, he had very incorrect ideas of *Christ* and of the christian religion ; as is manifest from his Rescript to Anulinus, in *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. x. c. 7. See *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 976. &c. *Schl.*]

(24) [He put to death his own son *Crispus*, and his wife *Fausta*, on a groundless suspicion ; and cut off his brother-in-law *Licinius*, and his unoffending son, contrary to his plighted word ; and was much addicted to pride and voluptuousness. *Schl.*]

(25) *Eusebius*, *de Vita Constantini*, Lib. iv. c. 61, 62.—Those who, in reliance on more recent and dubious authorities, maintain that *Constantine* received christian baptism, at Rome, in the year 324, and from the hands of *Sylvester*, then the bishop of Rome, do not at this day gain the assent of intelligent men, even in the Roman catholic church. See *Henry Noris*, *Historia Donatist.* in his *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 650. *Tho. Maria Mamachius*, *Origines et Antiqq. Christianae*, tom. ii. p. 232 &c. [*Valesius*, in his Notes on *Eusebius*, *de Vita Constantini*, L. iv. c. 61. where *Eusebius* relates, that *Constantine* first received imposition of hands, previous to his baptism, a little before his death ; infers, that the emperor then first became a *catechumen*, because he then first received imposition of hands. But the bishops laid hands on the catechumens, at various times, and for various purposes : and the connexion here shows, that *Eusebius* refers to that imposition of hands, which immediately preceded, and was connected with baptism. See *Tertullian*, *de Baptismo*, c. 20. It will not follow, therefore, that *Constantine* had never before received imposition of hands, for other purposes. But suppose he had not, still we do not know that the only mode of constituting a catechumen, in that age, was by imposition of hands : and if it was, so great an emperor might be excused from the ceremony, which could plead no divine authority. That *Constantine* long before this time, declared himself a *christian*, and was acknowledged as such by the churches, is certain. It is also true that he had for a long time performed the religious acts of an unbaptized christian, that is, of a *catechumen* ; for he attended public worship, fasted, prayed, observed the christian sabbath and the anniversaries of the martyrs, and watched on the vigils of Easter, &c. &c. Now these facts show that he had, in fact, long been a catechumen ; and that he did not first become so, at the time hands were laid on him in order to his baptism. See *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 966 &c. *Tr.*]

christian religion, or that he only feigned himself a christian. For in that age, many persons deferred baptism, till near the close of life; that they might pass into the other world, altogether pure and undefiled with sin:(26) and it is but too notorious, that many persons, who look upon the christian religion as indubitably true and of divine origin, yet do not conform their lives to all its holy precepts.—It is another question, whether worldly motives might not have contributed, in some degree, to induce Constantine to prefer the christian religion to the ancient Roman, and to all other religions, and to recommend the observance of it to his subjects. Indeed, it is no improbable conjecture, that the emperor had discernment to see, that christianity possessed great efficacy, and idolatry none at all, to strengthen public authority, and to bind citizens to their duty.(27)

§ 9. The sign of the cross, which *Constantine* most solemnly affirmed he saw in the heavens, near mid day, is a subject involved in the greatest obscurities and difficulties. It is, however, an easy thing to refute those who regard this prodigy as a cunning fiction of the emperor, or who rank it among fables:(28) and


(26) [See *Ant. Fred. Busching's* Disput. de Procrastinatione Baptismi apud veteres, ejusque Causis. Schl.]

(27) See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, L. i. c. 27. [The Romans had then lost nearly all their former virtue, fidelity, good sense and valor; and in their place, tyranny, profligacy, and shameful vices and crimes succeeded, and became prevalent, especially, during the persecution of the christians. Among the more intelligent, very little of the ancient superstitious spirit remained; so effectually had the christian and pagan philosophers exposed the turpitude of the old religion. But among the christians, who were spread far and wide in the Roman empire, and here and there had brought over some of the neighboring nations to their religion, great firmness and stability of mind was manifest, together with good faith and honesty. Hence *Constantine* the Great might readily see, that the christian religion would contribute much more to the tranquillity of the empire, and to the establishment of his dominion, than the old religion could do. Schl.]

(28) *Joh. Hornbeck*, Comment. ad Bullam Urbani viii. de Imaginum cultu, p. 182 &c. *Ja. Oiselius*, Thesaurus Numismat. antiquor. p. 463. *Ja. Tollius*, Preface to his French translation of *Longinus*; and in his Notes on *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 45. *Christ. Thomasius*, Observat. Hallens. tom. i. p. 380; and others. [There is difference of opinion as to the time when, and the place where, the emperor saw this cross. Some follow *Eusebius*, (de Vita Constantini L. i. c. 28.) and believe that he saw it while in Gaul, and when making preparations for the war with *Maxentius*. Others rely on the testimony of *Lactantius*, (de Mortib. Persequut. c. 44.) and believe that he saw the cross on the 26th day of October, AD. 312. [the day before the battle, in which *Maxentius* was vanquished, near Rome.] So thought *Stephan Baluze*; (see his Notes on this passage in *Lactantius*;) whom *Pagi*, *Fabricius*, and others have followed. The point is a difficult one to decide; and the brothers *Ballerini*, (Observ. ad *Norisii* Hist. Donatist. Opp. tom. iv. p. 662.) would compromise it, by supposing there were two appearances of the cross, both in dreams, the first in Gaul, and the last in Italy: which is a miserable shift.—Among those who regard the whole story as a fabrication, some suppose it was a pious fraud, and others that it was a trick of state. The first supposition is most improbable. For, at the time the cross is said to have appeared to him, *Constantine* thought nothing about spreading the christian religion, but only about vanquishing *Maxentius*. Besides he was not then a christian, and did not use the event for the advancement of christianity, but for the animation of his troops. The other supposition has more probability;

also those who refer the phenomenon to natural causes, ingeniously conjecturing that the form of a cross appeared in a solar halo, or in the moon : (29) and likewise those, who ascribe the transaction to the power of God, who intended by a miracle to confirm the wavering faith of the emperor. (30) Now these sup-

indeed, *Licinius* once resorted to something like this, according to *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequut. c. 46.—But *Constantine* solemnly averred the reality of this prodigy; and if he had been inclined to use artifice, in order to enkindle courage in his soldiers, he would far more probably, as his army was made up chiefly of barbarians, and such as were not christians, (see *Zosimus*, L. ii. p. 86.) have represented *Mars* or some other of the vulgar deities as appearing to him. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor. p. 978 &c. Schl.]

(29) See *Joh. Andr. Schmidt*, Diss. de Luna in Cruce visa, Jena, 1681. 4to. and *Joh. Albert. Fabricius*, Diss. de Cruce a Constantino visa, in his Biblioth. Gr. vol. vi. cap. i. p. 8 &c.—[This opinion also has its difficulties. *Fabricius* himself admits, that, on his hypothesis, the appearance of visible words in the air, cannot be explained. And he resorts to a new exposition of the language of *Eusebius*, for relief; and believes that the words by this conqueror, (ἐν τῷ σφύρακι, hac vince,) were not actually seen, but that the sense of them was emblematically depicted, in a crown of victory that appeared in the heavens. But (1) if the emperor intended to say this, he expressed himself very obscurely. (2) It is certain, that *Constantine* did not intend to be so understood; for he caused the very words mentioned to be affixed to the standards (Labara) of the legions, and to the medals and other monuments of the event; which he would not have done, had he not designed it should be understood, that these words were actually seen in the heavens. (3) All the ancient writers so understood the account given by *Eusebius*. (4) Such a halo about the sun, as that described by the emperor, has never been seen by man. For he did not see the sign or form of a real cross, but the Greek letter X, intersected perpendicularly by the letter P, thus . [*Euseb. de Vita Constant. L. i. § 31.*] See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christ. p. 965. Schl.]

(30) [*Eusebius* alone, (de Vita Constantini. L. i. c. 28—31.) among the writers of that age, gives us any account of the vision of the cross; though *Lactantius*, (de Mortib. Persequutor. c. 44.) and others speak of the “dream,” in which *Constantine* was directed to use the sign of the cross. *Eusebius*’ account is as follows: “He conceived that he ought to worship only the God of his father. He therefore called upon this God, in prayer, entreating and beseeching him, to manifest to him, who he was, and to extend his right arm, on the present occasion. While he was thus praying with earnest entreaty, a most singular divine manifestation (θεοσημία τις παραδοξοτάτη) appeared: which, perhaps, had another declared it, would not easily be credited; but the victorious emperor himself having related it, to us who write this, when we had, a long time afterwards, the privilege of knowing and conversing with him, and having confirmed it with an oath; who can hesitate to believe the account? and especially, as the subsequent time [or the events which followed] affords evidence of its truth? He said that, about the middle hours of the day, as the sun began to verge towards its setting, he saw in the heavens, with his own eyes, the sun surmounted with the trophy of the cross, (ὕψουςίμενον εἰς ἡλίου σταυρὸν ἐρόπαιον,) which was composed of light, and had a legend (γραφὴν) annexed, saying, by this conquer. And amazement seized him, and the whole army, at the sight, (ἐπὶ τῷ θεάματι,) and the beholders wondered, as they accompanied him in the march. And he said, he was at a loss what to make of this spectre, (τι ποτε εἶη τὸ φάσμα,) and as he pondered and reflected upon it long, night came upon him by surprise. After this, as he slept, (ὕπνῳ αὐτῷ,) the Christ of God appeared to him, together with the sign before seen in the heavens, and bid him make a representation of the sign that appeared in the heavens, and to use that as a protection (ἵνα τῷ ἀλεξήματι χρῆσθαι) against the onsets of his enemies. As soon as it was day, he arose, related the wonder (τὸ ἀπόρρητον) to his friends; and then assembling the workers in gold and precious stones, he seated himself in the

positions being rejected, the only conclusion that remains is, that *Constantine* saw, in a dream while asleep, the appearance of a cross, with the inscription, *by this conquer*.(31) Nor is this opinion unsupported by competent authorities of good credit.(32)

midst of them, and describing the appearance of the sign, (εἷς σημείον,) he bid them imitate it in gold and precious stones. This we were once so fortunate as to set our eyes upon." *Eusebius* then goes into a long description of this sacred standard, which was called the *Labarum*. Its shaft was a very long spear, overlaid with gold. On its top, was a crown composed of gold and precious stones, and containing the sacred symbol, namely, the Greek letter X, intersected with the letter P. Just under this crown, was a likeness of the emperor, in gold; and below that, a cross piece of wood, from which hung a square flag, of purple cloth embroidered and covered with precious stones.—Now, if this narrative is all true, and if two connected miracles were actually wrought, as here stated; how happens it, that no writer of that age, except *Eusebius*, says one word about the luminous cross in the heavens?—How came it, that *Eusebius* himself said nothing about it in his *Eccles. History*, which was written twelve years after the event, and about the same length of time before his *Life of Constantine*? Why does he rely solely on the testimony of the emperor, and not even intimate that he ever heard of it from others; whereas, if true, many thousands must have been eye-witnesses of the fact?—What mean his suggestions, that some may question the truth of the story; and his caution not to state any thing as a matter of public notoriety, but to confine himself simply to the emperor's private representation to himself?—Again, if the miracle of the luminous cross, was a reality; has not God himself sanctioned the use of the cross, as the appointed symbol of our religion? so that there is no superstition in the use of it; but, the Catholics are correct, and the Protestants in an error, on this subject?—If God intended to enlighten *Constantine's* dark mind, and show him the truth of christianity, would he probably use for the purpose the enigma of a luminous cross, in preference to his inspired word, or a direct and special revelation? Was there no tendency to encourage a superstitious veneration for the sign of the cross, in such a miracle?—And can it be believed, that *Jesus Christ* actually appeared to the emperor, in a vision, directing him to make an artificial cross, and to *rely upon that* as his *defence* in the day of battle?—But, how came the whole story of the luminous cross to be unknown to the christian world, for more than twenty five years, and then to transpire only through a private conversation between *Eusebius* and *Constantine*?—Is it not supposable, that *Eusebius* may have misunderstood the account the emperor gave him, of a singular halo about the sun which he saw, and of an affecting dream which he had the night after, and which induced him to make the *Labarum*, and use it as his standard?—Such are the arguments against this hypothesis. Tr.]

(31) [*Lactantius* mentions only the dream; and the same is true of *Sozomen*, Lib. i. c. 3. and *Ruffinus*, in his translation of the *Eccles. History* of *Eusebius*; and likewise, of the author of the *Chronicon Orientale*, p. 57. Indeed the appeal of *Eusebius* to the solemn attestation of the emperor, (de Vita Constantini, L. i. c. 28.) and the statement of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, (Acta Concilii Nicaeni, Lib. i. c. 4. in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. i. p. 351.) that the whole story was accounted fabulous by the pagans, confirm the supposition, that it was a mere dream. For the appeal of *Eusebius* would have been unnecessary, and the denial of its reality by the pagans would have been impossible, if the whole army of *Constantine* had been eye witnesses of the event. Schl.]

(32) The writers who treat of *Constantine* the Great, are carefully enumerated by *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, *Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exorians*, c. 12. p. 260 &c. [The latest and by far the best, (says *Heeren*, *Ancient Hist.* p. 475. ed. Bancroft. 1828.) is, *Leben Constantin des Grossen*, von J. C. F. Manso, Bresl. 1817.] *Fabricius* moreover, (Ibid. c. 13. p. 273 &c.) describes the laws of *Constantine*, relating to religious matters, under four heads. The same laws are treated of by *Jac. Godfrey*, *Adnot. ad Codicem Theodosianum*; and in a particular treatise, by *Francis Baldwin*, in his *Constantinus Magn. seu de Legibus Constantini Ecclesiast. et civilibus*, Libri ii. ed. 2d. by B. Gundling, Halle, 1727. 8vo.

§ 10. The happiness anticipated by the christians from the edicts of *Constantine* and *Licinius*, was a little afterwards interrupted by *Licinius*, who waged war against his kinsman *Constantine*. Being vanquished in the year 314, he was quiet for about nine years. But in the year 324, this restless man again attacked *Constantine*, being urged on both by his own inclination and by the instigation of the pagan priests. That he might secure to himself a victory, he attached the pagans to his cause, by severely oppressing the christians, and putting not a few of their bishops to death.(33) But all his plans failed. For, after several unsuccessful battles, he was obliged to throw himself upon the mercy of the victor; who, nevertheless, ordered him to be strangled, in the year 325. After his victory over *Licinius*, *Constantine* reigned sole emperor till his death; and by his plans, his enactments, his regulations, and his munificence, he endeavored as much as possible, to obliterate gradually the ancient superstitions, and to establish christian worship throughout the Roman empire.(34) He had undoubtedly learned from the wars and the machinations of *Licinius*, that neither himself nor the Roman empire could remain secure, while the ancient superstition continued prevalent; and therefore, from this time onward, he openly opposed the pagan deities and their worship, as being prejudicial to the interests of the state.

§ 11. After the death of *Constantine*, which happened in the year 337, his three surviving sons, *Constantine II.* *Constantius*, and *Constans*, assumed the empire, and were all proclaimed Augusti and emperors by the Roman senate. There were still living two brothers of *Constantine* the Great, namely *Constantius Dalmatius*, and *Julius Constans*, and they had several sons. But nearly all these were slain by the soldiers at the command of *Constantine's* sons, who feared lest their thirst for power might

(33) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. x. c. 8. and, de Vita Constantini, L. i. c. 49. Even *Julian*, than whom no one was more prejudiced against *Constantine*, could not but pronounce *Licinius* an infamous tyrant, who was sunk in vices and crimes. See *Julian's* Caesares, p. 222. ed. Spanheim.—I would here observe, what appears to have been overlooked hitherto, that *Aurelius Victor* mentions this persecution of *Licinius*, in his Book de Caesaribus, c. 41. p. 435. ed. Arntzenii, where he says: Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobillium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum fecere. The *Philosophers*, whom *Licinius* is here said to have tortured, were, doubtless, *christians*; whom many, from their slight acquaintance with our religion, have mistaken for a sect of philosophers. The commentators on *Aurelius* have left this passage untouched; which is apt to be the case with those, who are intent only on the enlargement of grammatical knowledge derived from ancient writers.

(34) [Constantine doubtless committed errors, which in their consequences were injurious to the cause of christianity. He gave to the clergy the former privileges of the pagan priests; and allowed legacies to be left to the churches, which were every where erected and enlarged. He was gratified with seeing the bishops assume great state; for he thought, the more respect the bishops commanded, the more inclined the pagans would be to embrace christianity: and thus he introduced the love of pomp and display among the clergy. Schl.]

lead them to make insurrections and disturb the commonwealth.(35) Only *Gallus* and *Julian*, sons of *Julius Constans*, escaped the massacre ;(36) and the latter of these afterwards became emperor. *Constantine* II. held Britain, Gaul, and Spain ; but lost his life AD. 340, in a war with his brother *Constantius*. *Constans* at first governed only Illyricum, Italy, and Africa ; but after the fall of his brother *Constantine* II. he annexed his provinces to his empire, and thus became emperor of all the West, until he lost his life AD. 350, in the war with *Maxentius*, a usurper. After the death of *Constans*, *Maxentius* being subdued, the third brother *Constantius*, who had before governed Asia, Syria, and Egypt, in the year 353 became sole emperor, and governed the whole empire till the year 361, when he died. Neither of these brothers possessed the disposition or the discernment of their father ; yet they all pursued their father's purpose, of abolishing the ancient superstitions of the Romans and other pagans, and of propagating the christian religion throughout the Roman empire. The thing itself was commendable and excellent ; but in the means employed, there was much that was censurable.(37)

§ 12. The cause of christianity, which had been thus flourishing and prosperous, received immense injury, and seemed on the brink of ruin, when *Julian*, the son of *Julius Constans*, brother of *Constantine* the Great, now the only surviving branch of the Constantinian family,(38) after a successful campaign in Gaul AD. 360, was hailed emperor by his soldiers, and on the death of *Constantius*, AD. 361, obtained possession of the whole em-

(35) ["It is more probable, that the principal design of this massacre was to recover the provinces of *Thrace*, *Macedon*, and *Achaia*, which in the divisions of the empire, *Constantine* the Great had given to young *Dalmatius*, son of his brother of the same name, and *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*, which he had granted to *Anibalianus*, the brother of young *Dalmatius*. Be that as it will, *Dr. Mosheim* has attributed this massacre equally to the three sons of *Constantine* ; whereas almost all authors agree, that neither young *Constantine*, nor *Constans*, had any hand in it at all." *Macl.*]

(36) [Because they were despised : *Gallus*, being sickly, it was supposed would not live long ; and *Julian*, being but eight years old, created no fear. Some years after, they were sent to a remote place in *Cappadocia*, where they were instructed in languages, the sciences, and gymnastics, being in a sense kept prisoners ; and were at last designed for the clerical office, having been made lecturers or readers. *Ammianus Marcell.* L. xxii. c. 9. *Schl.*]

(37) [Coercive measures were adopted, which only made nominal christians. A law was enacted, in the year 342, that all the heathen temples should be shut up, and that no person should be allowed to go near them. All sacrifices, and all consultations of the oracles and soothsayers, were prohibited, on pain of death and confiscation of property : and the provincial magistrates were threatened with the same penalties, if they were dilatory in punishing transgressors of the law. This was to compel the conscience, and not to convince it. The history of these emperors may be found in the *Universal History*, and in *le Beau's History of the Eastern Empire.* *Schl.*]

(38) [For, *Gallus*, who had been created Caesar, was previously murdered by order of *Constantius*, because of his cruelty, and being charged with aspiring after the supreme power. *Ammian. Marcell.* L. xiv. c. 11. *Schl.*]

pire. For, *Julian*, though educated in the christian religion, yet influenced partly by hatred of the Constantinian family, which had murdered his father, brother, and all his relatives, and partly by the artifices of the Platonic philosophers, who deceived this credulous and vain-glorious prince with fictitious miracles and prophecies, apostatized from christianity to paganism, and labored to restore idolatry, now ready to become extinct, to its former splendor. *Julian* seemed to abhor all violent measures, and to wish to give full liberty to the citizens of choosing their religion, and of worshipping God in the manner they pleased : but at the same time he artfully and dexterously cut the sinews of the christian cause, by abrogating the privileges granted to this religion and to its ministers, by shutting up the christian schools in which philosophy and the liberal arts were taught, by not only tolerating but even encouraging and animating all sectarians, by writing books against the christians, &c. He likewise had many projects in contemplation ; and would, doubtless, have done immense harm to christianity, if he had returned victorious from the Persian war, which he undertook directly after he came to the throne. But in this war, which was both undertaken and carried on with little discretion, he fell by a wound received in battle, AD. 363, when just entered the thirty second year of his age, and after reigning sole emperor only twenty months, from the death of *Constantius*.(39)

§ 13. Those who rank *Julian* among the greatest heroes the world has produced, nay place him the first of all who ever filled a throne—which many at this day do, and among them are persons of learning and discernment—(40) must be so blinded by

(39) See, besides *Tillemont* ; [the Universal History ; *le Beau*, Histoire du bas Empire, tom. iii Liv. xii—xiv ;] and other common writers ; the accurately written work of *Bletterie*, Vie de Julien, Paris 1734, and Amsterd. 1735. 8vo ; the Life and character of *Julian* the Apostate, illustrated in vii Dissertations, by *Des Vaux*, Dublin 1746. 8vo ; *Ez. Spanheim*, Preface and Notes to the Works of *Julian*, Lips. 1696. Fol. and *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xiv. p. 204 &c. [Add *Aug. Neander*, über Kayser Julianus und sein Zeitalter, Hamb. 1812. 8vo Tr.]

(40) *Montesquieu*, Esprit des Loix, Liv. xxiv. c. 10. says : Il n'y a point eu après lui de Prince plus digne de gouverner des hommes. [To form a correct judgment of *Julian*, it is necessary cursorily to survey the history of his life. He was born AD. 331 ; and lost his mother *Basilina*, the same year ; and his father, *Julius Constantius*, a few years after. *Mardonius*, a eunuch, and *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, were his first instructors. When *Gallus* was made a Caesar, *Julian* obtained permission to come to Constantinople, where he attended the public schools ; then he went to Bithynia, every where attaching himself to the most noted teachers ; and read and imitated the orations of *Libanius*, a pagan sophist, whom he was strictly forbidden to hear. At Pergamus, he became acquainted with *Aedesius*, an aged Platonic philosopher, and heard his scholars, *Eusebius* and *Chrysanthus*, as also *Maximus*, of Ephesus, who initiated him in theurgia, brought him to apostatize from christianity, and presaged his elevation to the throne. This change in his religion, he was obliged to conceal from *Constantius* and *Gallus*. *Julian* therefore devoted himself to a monastic life, assumed the tonsure, and became a public reader in the church at Nicomedia. In the year 354, after the death of *Gallus*, he was deprived of his liberty, and carried to Milan. After being in custody there seven months, he obtained, by the inter-

prejudice, as not to see the truth ; or, they never read attentively *Julian's* writings which still remain ; or, lastly, they do not know,

cession of the empress, *Eusebia*, a release, and liberty to travel into Greece, where he applied himself, at Athens, to the sciences and to eloquence, and became acquainted with *Basil* and *Gregory* of Nazianzen. In the year 355, he was proclaimed Caesar, and had Gaul, Spain, and Britain intrusted to him. But *Constantius* greatly limited his power, and nominated not only the military commanders there, but also the officers of *Julian's* court, who were to keep strict watch over him. To this his elevation, *Eusebia* contributed much, she being anxious about the succession to the throne, on account of her continued barrenness : and the rebellion of *Sylvanus*, which took place in the beginning of this year, as also the continual incursions of the bordering nations which required a general in Gaul, favored the measure. *Julian* performed some successful campaigns in Gaul, which procured him the affections not only of the soldiery, but of all the Gallic subjects. This awakened the jealousy of *Constantius*, who, under pretext of the Persian war, recalled a great part of the troops from Gaul. In the spring of 360, the soldiers proclaimed *Julian* Augustus, and compelled him to assume that dignity. A reconciliation was attempted in vain. *Constantius* insisted upon it, that *Julian* should resign. *Julian* prosecuted the German war successfully, and strengthened and fortified the frontiers ; and after vanquishing the Germans, whom *Constantius* had excited against him, and subduing Illyria and Italy, he marched unencumbered against *Constantius* ; who came forward to meet him, but was taken sick on the way, and died in Cilicia. *Julian* now took quiet possession of the whole Roman empire ; caused *Constantius* to be honorably buried ; but called his principal officers to account before a special court, as the authors of numerous acts of violence. He likewise attempted great reforms in the court, in which prodigality and pomp had risen to a great height. He also dismissed many useless officers : and filled his court with philosophers and soothsayers, to whom he showed particular respect. During the Illyrian campaign, in the year 361, he publicly sacrificed to the Gods ; and after the death of *Constantius*, he let it be distinctly known, that it was his purpose to reinstate idolatrous worship. But, as he was aware of the ill consequences which formerly resulted from direct persecution, and wished to avoid the repetition of them, and coveted the reputation of being magnanimous and benevolent, and as, in prospect of his Persian campaign, he stood in fear of the numerous body of christians ; he endeavored to assail and to undermine them, by artifice. For this purpose, he adopted the following measures. First, he endeavored to reform the pagan idolatry, and to introduce improvements in it derived from the christian worship. With this view, he attended to his official duties as Pontifex Maximus, with more earnestness than any of his predecessors ; and even treated them as of more consequence than the government of the empire. He offered sacrifices daily, in his palace and garden ; attended the public sacrifices on all the pagan festivals, and officiated personally in them, without the least regard to decorum, even as to the meanest service. He reestablished the public sacrifices of the cities and provinces. Where there were no temples, or where the destroyers of the ancient temples could not be found, or were his own predecessors, there he erected temples at his own cost, and gave to the idolatrous priests high rank and large revenues. As he had been converted to paganism by philosophers, who were of the new Platonic School, and who held much to theurgia, magic, divination, and apparitions, and were willing to borrow from christianity ; hence originated many burdensome purifications, and prolix ceremonies of worship, together with a considerable aping of christian institutions. He was strenuous for the virtuous behavior, the morality and beneficence of the priests ; and he forbid their going to theatres, or having much intercourse with those in civil authority. He wished to place the reading of useful books, giving public exhortations, and taking care of the poor, the sick, and funerals, on the same footing as they were among the christians : and he required, that the priests in many places should annually be supplied with corn and wine and money, which they were to distribute to the poor. Secondly, he supported and extended wider the internal divisions among the christians. For, he restored all silenced and ejected teachers, and required that such parties as had been laid under ecclesiastical censures, should be reinstated in their privileges. He wrote letters to the most noted and

what constitutes true greatness and excellence. If we set aside genius—which, however, as his writings show, in him was not above mediocrity—military courage, love of learning, acquaintance with that fanatical and vain philosophy called modern Platonism, and lastly patience of labor; all that remains in *Julian* was certainly little and unworthy of commendation. His excellencies were counterbalanced by very great defects; first, a monstrous and almost anile superstition—the surest indication of a little mind—then, a puerile pursuit of applause and vulgar popularity, extreme credulity and instability, a disposition to use dissimulation and underhanded means, and finally, ignorance of solid and sound philosophy. I will grant that, in some respects, he was superior to the *sons* of Constantine the Great; but in many respects was he inferior to *Constantine himself*, whom he censures so immoderately.

§ 14. As *Julian* affected to appear indisposed to trouble any of his subjects on account of their religion, and opposed to no sect whatever, he showed so much indulgence to the Jews, as to

most restless heretics, and encouraged them to disseminate their doctrines. He allowed the leading members of the different parties to come to him, and under color of attempting to reconcile their differences, he inflamed them more against each other. *Thirdly*, he deprived the clergy of the franchises and permanent incomes, which they had enjoyed under the former emperors; especially, of their exemption from burdensome civil duties, and of the distribution of corn to the churches from the emperor's storehouses; and he compelled the monks and the ministers of religion, by force, to perform military duty. *Fourthly*, he excluded the christians from all promotions, and in terms of bitter sarcasm, forbid their access to the public schools, their studying the Greek authors and sciences, and their practising physic. *Fifthly*, he commanded the idolatrous temples, images, and altars, to be rebuilt, at the cost of those who had pulled them down. *Sixthly*, acts of violence done by pagans to christians, he either did not punish at all, or punished very slightly, only requiring them to make restitution. On the contrary, every tumult among christians was punished, most severely; and commonly, the bishops and the churches were made accountable for them. *Seventhly*, he connected idolatry with all solemn transactions, and with the manifestations of respect due to himself, and made a participation in it unavoidable. The soldiers for instance, when extraordinary gratuities were presented them, must strew incense upon an altar; and to all the publicly exhibited pictures of the emperor, idolatrous deities were attached. *Eighthly*, he ridiculed the christians and their worship, scornfully; and wrote books in confutation of their doctrines. His work against christianity, which was composed in the year 363, and in part during his Persian campaign, is lost. Indeed the Marquis *d'Argen's*, in the *Défense du paganisme, par l'Empereur Julien, en Grec et François, avec des Dissertations et Notes*, Berlin, 1764, 8vo. has endeavored to recover this work, by means of the Confutation of it by *Cyril*. But the recovery is very incomplete. Yet these remains of it show, that the book was more likely to injure christianity, by the style in which it was written, and by the perversion of scripture, than by either the strength or the originality of its arguments and objections. *Ninth* and lastly, the emperor showed much partiality to the Jews, and allowed them to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, in order to confute by facts the prediction of *Christ*. Immediately after, there were banishments, tortures, and executions of christians, under pretence that they had showed themselves refractory against the commands of the emperor; and there were many, especially in the eastern provinces, who became apostates. Yet there were not wanting resolute confessors of the christian religion. See *Baumgarten's Auszug der Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. p. 763, 780, 792 &c. *Schl.*]

give them liberty to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The Jews commenced the work, but were obliged to desist before even the foundations were laid. For balls of fire issued from the ground, accompanied with a great explosion and a tremendous earthquake, which dispersed both the materials that were collected and the workmen. The fact itself is abundantly attested ;(41) though the christians, as often happens in such cases, appear to have amplified it, inconsiderately, with some additional miracles. As to the causes which produced the event, there is room for debate, and there is debate. All however who weigh the subject with an impartial mind, will easily perceive, that they must join with those who ascribe the phenomenon to the omnipotent will of God ; and that they, who choose to ascribe it to natural causes or to artifice and fraud, offer no objections which are insurmountable.(42)

§ 15. The soldiers elected *Jovian* to succeed *Julian*. He died in the year 364, after reigning seven months ; and therefore accomplished but little.(43) The other emperors of this century, who

(41) See *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, *Lux salutar. Evangelii toti orbi exorians*, p. 124. where the testimonies are collected. See also the acute English Knight, *Walter Moyle*, *Posthumous works*, p. 101 &c. [The principal authorities cited by *Fabricius* are, *Chrysostom*, *Homil. v. adv. Judaeos, et alibi, saepius*; *Ammianus Marcell.* Lib. xxiii. c. i.; *Gregory Naz.* *Orat. iv.*; *Ambrose*, *Ep. 40*, (al. 29. written AD. 388.) *Socrates*, H. E. Lib. iii. c. 20; *Sozomen*, H. E. Lib. v. c. 21; *Theodoret*, H. E. Lib. iii. c. 20; *Ruffinus*, H. E. Lib. i. c. 37; *Philostorgius*, H. E. Lib. vii. c. 9, 14; *Hist. Eccles. Tripartita*, L. vi. c. 43; *Nicephorus*, L. x. c. 32; *Zonaras*, L. xiii. c. 12; Rabbi *David Gantz*, *Zemach David*, Pt. ii p. 36; Rabbi *Gedaliah*, *Schalschelet Hakkabala*, p. 109.—*Dr. Lardner*, (*Collection of Jewish and heathen Testimonies*, vol. iv. p. 57—71. ed. Lond. 1767.) maintains the whole story to be false. His chief arguments are that *Julian* only *purposed* to rebuild the temple, *after* his Persian expedition; that he needed all his resources for that expedition; the silence of *some* of the fathers, living near the time; and the decorations of the story by others of them. But these arguments seem wholly insufficient, against the explicit testimony of so many credible witnesses, christians and pagans, and several of them contemporary with the event. *Tr.*]

(42) *Ja. Barnage*, in his *Historie des Juifs*, tom. iv p. 1257 &c. contests the reality of this miracle. Against him appeared *Gisb. Cuiperus*, in his *Epistolae*, p. 400, edited by *Bayer*. Recently, *Wm. Warburton* has maintained the reality of the miracle, with an excess of ingenuity, in an appropriate treatise, entitled: *Julian, or a Discourse concerning the earthquake and fiery eruption, which defeated that emperor's attempt to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem*; London, 1750. 8vo.

(43) See *Bletterie*, *Viede Jovien*, 2 vol. 8vo. Paris 1748. in which work he completes the history of *Julian*, and gives a French translation of some of *Julian's* writings.—[The following notices are worth inserting. Both during the lifetime of *Julian*, and after his death when the soldiers made him emperor, *Jovian* openly declared himself on the side of christianity. For when *Julian* gave orders to all the military officers who were christians, to either quit the army, or renounce their religion; *Jovian* chose to relinquish his office. But *Julian* would not release him, but gave him promotion during the Persian war. When chosen emperor, *Jovian* would not accept the office, until the army had declared themselves in favor of christianity. When he arrived at Antioch, he repealed all the laws of *Julian*, adverse to christianity: (*Ruffinus*, Lib. xi. c. 1. and *Sozomen*, L. vi. c. 3.) and wrote to all the provincial governors, commanding them to take diligent

reigned after *Jovian*, were *Flav. Valentinian I.* [in the West, from AD. 364—375. with] *Flav. Valens* [in the East, from AD. 364—378.] then *Flav. Gratian* [in the West, AD. 375—383. with] *Flav. Valentinian II.* [also in the West, AD. 375—392, and *Theodosius* the Great, in the East, AD. 379—395.] *Honorius*, [in the West, AD. 395—423, with *Arcadius*, in the East, AD. 395—408.] All these were christians, and did much to advance the religion they professed. They all endeavored, though not with equal zeal to extirpate wholly the pagan religions. In this particular, *Theodosius* the Great, the last emperor of this century, [in the East, except *Arcadius*,] exceeded all the rest. He came to the throne AD. 389—and died AD. 395. And during his whole life, he did all he could to extirpate idolatry throughout the provinces of the empire, and enacted severe laws against the adherents to it. The same design was prosecuted by his sons *Arcadius* and *Honorius*; so that, in the close of this century, the ancient superstitions were ready to expire, and had lost all their respectability.(44)

§ 16 Yet this severity of the government could not prevent the existence of some pagan fanes and ceremonies, especially in the remoter provinces. Indeed, these rigorous laws against the worshippers of the pagan deities, seem to have been aimed rather against the common people, than against persons of rank and distinction. For it appears, that during the reign of *Theodosius*, as well as after his death, individuals filled the highest offices, and continued in them till old age, who are known to have been averse from christianity and attached to paganism. Of this *Libanius* is an example, who was very hostile to the christians, and yet was made præfect of the prætorian guards by *Theodosius* himself. Perhaps greater indulgence was shown to philosophers, rhetoricians, and military commanders, than to other people, on account of their supposed usefulness to the commonwealth.

§ 17. Yet these very rhetoricians and philosophers, whose schools were supposed to be so profitable to the community, exhausted all their ingenuity, both before the days of *Constantine*

care, that the christians should not be disturbed in their public assemblies. He restored to the churches, the clergy, and to widows, all the franchises and privileges, which had been granted them by *Constantine* and his sons, but which *Julian* had taken from them. He likewise restored the use of the *Labarum*, or the standard with a cross: and he compelled one *Magnus* to rebuild the church of Berytus, at his own cost, he having commanded it to be demolished. *Theodorit*, Lib. iv. c. 19. In regard to the religious controversies of that day, he joined with the orthodox, against the Arians; and he treated *Athanasius* with peculiar respect. See *Baumgarten's* Auszug der Kirchenhistorie, vol. ii. p. 805. and the Universal History. Schl.]

(44) See the laws of these emperors, in favor of the christian religion, and against the professors and friends of the ancient religion, in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. vi. and *Peter and Jerome Ballerini*, Diss. i. in *Zenonem Veronensem*, p. 45 &c. Veranae 1739. Fol.

the Great, and afterwards, to arrest the progress of christianity. In the beginning of this century, *Hierocles*, the great ornament of the Platonic school, composed two books against the christians; in which he had the audacity to compare our Savior with *Apollonius Tyanaeus*, and for which he was chastised by *Eusebius* [Caesariensis] in a tract written expressly against him. (45) *Lactantius* speaks of another philosopher who endeavored to convince the christians they were in error; but his name is not mentioned. (46) After the reign of *Constantine* the Great, *Julian* wrote a large volume against the christians, and *Himerius* (47) and *Libanius* (48) in their public declamations, and *Eunapius* in his

(45) [*Hierocles*, who flourished about AD. 303, was governor of Bithynia, and afterwards praefect of Egypt. He was a zealous persecutor of the christians, and wielded both the sword and the pen against them. His character and his two Books, addressed to the christians, are thus described by *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinar. L. v. c. 2, 3. "He was one of the judges, and was the principal author of the persecution [under *Diocletian*.] But not content with this crime, he also attacked with his pen the people he persecuted: for he composed two Books,—not against the christians, lest he should seem to address them as an enemy,—but to the christians, that he might appear friendly to them and anxious for their good. In these books he endeavors to prove the falsehood of the scriptures, by making them appear full of contradictions."—"He particularly assailed *Peter* and *Paul* and the other disciples, as disseminators of falsehood; and he accuses them of being rude and illiterate persons, because some of them had lived by fishing."—"He affirms, that *Christ* was outlawed by the Jews; and that he afterwards collected a company of 900 banditti, and became a robber."—"Also, wishing to overthrow his miracles, (which he does not pretend to deny,) he attempts to show, that *Apollonius* had performed as great, and even greater."—"I do not say, (he adds,) that the reason why *Apollonius* was never accounted a God, was, that he chose not to be so regarded: but I say, that we are wiser,—in not attaching at once the idea of divinity to the working of miracles,—than you are, who believe a person a God, merely on account of a few wonderful acts."—"Having poured out such crudities of his ignorance, and having labored utterly to extirpate the truth, he has the temerity to entitle his nefarious Books, which are hostile to God, (φιλαληθείς,) devoted to the truth."—*Eusebius*, Liber contra Hieroclem, Gr. and Lat. is subjoined to his Demonstratio Evangelica, ed. Paris, 1623.—See *Lardner's Works*, vol. viii. and *Bayle*, Dictionaire Histor. et Crit. art. Hierocles (2d) Tr.]

(46) *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinar. Lib. v. c. 2.

(47) See *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. clxv. p. 355. [The works of *Himerius*, are lost. Tr.]

(48) [*Libanius*, the sophist, was born at Antioch about AD. 314, and lived probably till about the end of the century. He taught rhetoric and declamation at Nice, Nicomedia, Constantinople, Athens, and Antioch. His schools were large, sometimes amounting to more than 80 pupils: and rival sophists envied him. The emperor *Julian*, when young, was forbidden to attend the school of *Libanius*; but he obtained and read his writings, and made them his model as to style. When *Julian* came to the throne he offered *Libanius* a public office, which the sophist proudly refused. Yet the emperor and he were very good friends. *Libanius* was an inflated, pedantic man, full of himself, yet independent in his feelings, and free in the expression of his opinions. He was an avowed pagan, yet a strenuous advocate for religious toleration. His numerous writings still remain, consisting of a prolix Life of himself, a large number of eulogies and declamations, and more than a 1000 letters. They seldom contain either profound or original thought, or display research: and the style is concise, affected, and pedantic. Yet they are of some use, to throw light on the times in which he lived. They were published, Gr. and Lat. vol. i. Paris 1666, and vol. ii. by *Morell*, 1627. Fol. The most complete edition of his Epistles, is by *Wolf*

lives of the philosophers, zealously decried the christian religion.(49) Yet no one of these persons was punished at all, for the licentiousness of his tongue or of his pen.

§ 18. How much harm these sophists or philosophers, who were full of the pride of imaginary knowledge, and of hatred to the christian name, did to the cause of christianity in this century, appears from many examples, and especially from the apostacy of *Julian*, who was seduced by men of this stamp. Among those who wished to appear wise, and to take moderate ground, many were induced by the arguments and explanations of these men, to devise a kind of reconciling religion, intermediate between the old superstition and christianity ; and to imagine that *Christ* had enjoined the very same things, which had long been represented by the pagan priests under the envelope of their ceremonies and fables. Of these views were *Ammianus Marcellinus*, a very prudent and discreet man,(50) *Chalcidius*, a philosopher,(51) *Themistius*, a very celebrated orator,(52) and others, who conceiv-

Amsterdam, 1738. Fol. A volume containing 17 of his Declamations, was published at Venice, 1755.—See his Life, written by himself, in his Works, vol. ii. p. 1—84. *Eunapius*, Vitae Philos. et Sophistarum, p. 130 &c. and among the moderns, *Tillemont*, Histoire des Empereurs, tom. iv. p. 571 &c. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. tom. vii. p. 376—414. *Lardner*, Heathen Testimonies, vol. iv p. 127—163. and *Gibbon*, Decline and fall of Rom. Emp. ch xxiv. Tr.]

(49) [See *Eunapius*, Lives of *Aedesius*, *Maximus*, &c. *Eunapius* also wrote a chronicle, to which he frequently refers in his Lives of the Sophists ; the first edition of which is full of reproaches against the christians and Constantine the Great ; the second edition is more temperate. Both editions were extant in the times of *Photius* : see his biblioth. Codex lxxvii. Schl.]

(50) [*Ammianus Marcellinus*, a celebrated Latin historian, of Grecian extract, was a soldier, for at least twenty years, from AD. 350 onwards, and served in the honorable corps called Protectores Domestici. On retiring from military life, he fixed his residence at Rome, where he lived perhaps till the end of the century. There it was, he composed his faithful and valuable history. The work originally consisted of thirty one Books, and gave the Roman history from the accession of *Nerva*, (where *Suetonius* ends,) to the death of *Valens*. The first 13 Books, which must have been very concise, are lost. The last 18, which are more full, include the period from AD. 353—378. The style is harsh and unpollished, and sometimes difficult ; but the fidelity and accuracy of the narration render the work highly valuable. *Marcellinus* was probably a *real pagan* ; but he was not a bigot, and he was willing to give every one his due, according to his best judgment. The best editions of his work, are, that of *Valesius*, republished by *Gronovius*, Leyden 1693 Fol. and 4to. and that of *Ernesti*, Lips. 1775. 8vo. See *Bayle*, Dictionaire histor. et critique, art. *Marcellin*. Tr.]

(51) [*Chalcidius*, a philosopher of the 4th century, was author of a Latin translation of the *Timæus* of *Plato*, and of a Commentary on it, which were published by *J. Meursius*, Lugd. Bat. 1617. 4to. *Dr. Mosheim's* opinion of his religious faith is farther developed in his Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia, § 31. and in his notes on *Cudworth's* intellectual System, vol. i. p. 732 &c. *J. A. Fabricius*, (in his notes on *Chalcidius*, passim ; and in his Biblioth. Latina L. iii. c. 7 p. 557 &c.) and some others, hold that *Chalcidius* was a pagan.—*Brucher*, (Hist. crit. Philos. tom. iii. p. 472 &c.) makes him a christian, though infected with the new Platonism of his age. Tr.]

(52) *Themistius*, a Greek philosopher of Paphlagonia, called *Euphrades*, (the fine speaker,) from his eloquent and commanding delivery, was made a Roman senator, and enjoyed the favor of *Constantius*, *Julian*, and the succeeding emperors, down to *Theodosius* the Great, who made him praelect of Constantinople,

ed that both religions were in unison, as to all the more important points, if they were rightly understood ; and therefore held, that *Christ* was neither to be contemned, nor to be honored to the exclusion of the pagan deities.(53)

§ 19. As *Constantine* the Great, and his sons and successors, took much pains to enlarge the christian church, it is not strange that many nations, before barbarous and uncivilized, became subject to *Christ*.(54) Many circumstances make it probable, that the light of christianity cast some of its rays into both *Armenias*, the greater and the less, soon after the establishment of the christian church.(55) But the *Armenian* church first received due organization and firm establishment, in this century ; in the beginning of which, *Gregory*, the son of *Anax*, commonly called the *Illuminator*, (φωστῆρα,) because he dispelled the mists of superstition which beclouded the minds of the *Armenians* ; first persuaded some private individuals, and afterwards *Tiridates* the king of the *Armenians*, as well as his nobles, to embrace and observe the christian religion. He was therefore ordained the first bishop of *Armenia*, by *Leontius* bishop of *Cappadocia* ; and gradually diffused the principles of christianity throughout that country.(56)

§ 20. In the middle of this century, one *Frumentius* proceeded from *Egypt* into the neighboring country of *Abyssinia* or *Ethiopia*, the inhabitants of which were called *Auxumitae*, from their capital city *Auxuma*, and baptized both the king of the country, and very many of the nobles. Afterwards returning to *Egypt*, he was consecrated, by *St. Athanasius*, first bishop of the *Auxumi-*

and appointed him tutor to his son *Arcadius*. He wrote, when young, some commentaries on *Aristotle*, fragments of which are still extant, and 33 of his Orationes. His works are best edited by *Harduin*, Paris 1684 Fol. He was a strenuous advocate for the free toleration of all religions, as being all good, and tending to the same result by different ways. Concerning him and his religious views, see *Brucker's* *Historia crit. philos.* tome ii. p. 484 &c. Tr.]

(53) [This favorite opinion of *Dr. Mosheim*, he defends more at length, in his *Dis. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, § 30, 31, 32 ; among his *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, vol. i. p. 85—216, *Altonae* 1733.—But it seems not necessary to adopt this hypothesis, which has but slender support from argument ; because the Eclectic or new Platonic philosophy, might easily lead its votaries to speak in terms of moderation, and even of commendation, of the christian religion, especially in an age when it prevailed almost universally, and was the religion of the state and of the imperial court. Tr.]

(54) *Gaudentius*, *Vita Philastrii*, § iii. *Philastrius*, de *Haeres.* Praef. p. 5. ed. *Fabricii*. *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 19. *Georgius Cedrenus*, *Chronograph.* p. 234. ed. *Paris* : and others.

(55) [For *Eusebius*, (*Hist. Eccles.* L. vi. c. 46.) informs us that *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, about the year 260, “ wrote concerning penance, to the Brethren of *Armenia*, over whom *Meruzanes* was bishop :” and, according to the *Acta Martyrum*, some *Armenians* suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under *Decius*, (AD. 250.) and *Diocletian*, (AD. 304.) Tr.]

(56) See *Narratio de Rebus Armeniae*, in *Fr. Combefis*, *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr. Graecor.* tom. ii. p. 287 &c. *Mich. La Quien*, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 419 and 1356. *J. J. Schröderi* *Thesaur. Linguae Armenicae*, p. 149 &c.

tae. From this circumstance, the Ethiopic church, even to this day, is dependant on that of Alexandria, and receives its bishop from it.(57)—In *Iberia*, a province of Asia which is now called *Georgia*, a christian woman who had been carried captive into that country, partly by the sanctity of her life, and partly by miracles, induced the king and his queen to renounce idolatry and embrace *Christ*, and also to send for priests from Constantinople, from whom they and their people might gain a more accurate and full knowledge of the christian religion.(58)

§ 21. A part of the *Goths*, inhabiting Thrace, Moesia, and Dacia, [now the north east part of Rumelia, with Bulgaria and Wallachia, on the Danube,] had embraced christianity before the commencement of this century ;(59) and *Theophilus* their bishop was present at the Nicene council.(60) *Constantine* the Great, after having vanquished them and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become christians.(61) But still a large part of the nation remained estranged from *Christ*, until the times of the emperor *Valens* ; who permitted them to pass the river *Ister*, [or Danube,] and to inhabit Dacia, Moesia, and Thrace, on condition that they would be subject to the Roman laws, and would embrace christianity ; to which condition, their king *Fritiger* consented.(62) The bishop of the Goths inhabiting Moesia in this century, was the much celebrated *Ulphilas* ; who, among other laudable deeds, gave his countrymen an alphabet of his own invention, and translated the bible for them into the Gothic language.(63)

(57) *Athanasius*, Apologia ad Constantium, Opp. tom. i. Pt. ii. p. 315. ed. Benedict. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. c. 49. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 24. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 23. *Job Ludolf*, Comment. ad Histor. Aethiopic. p. 281. *Jerome Lobo*, Voyage d'Abissinie, tome ii. p. 13 &c. *Justus Fontanus*, Historia litterar. Aquiloniae. p. 174.

(58) *Rufinus*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 10. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 7. *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 1333 &c.

(59) [*Philostorgius*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 5. *Schl.*]

(60) [*Joh. Harduin*, Conciliorum Tomus i. p. 319. *Schl.*]

(61) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 18.

(62) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 33. *Le Quien*, Oriens Christ. tom. i. p. 1240. *Eric Benzell*, Praef. ad iv. Evangelia Gothica, (ascribed to *Ulphilas*,) c. v. p. xviii &c. ed. Oxon. 1750. 4to.

(63) *Joh. Jac. Mascovii* Historia Germanor. tom. i. p. 317. tom. ii. Note, p. 49. Acta Sanctor. March, vol. iii. p. 619. *Eric Benzell*, loc. cit. cap. viii. p. xxx [J. C. Zahn, Einleitung in *Ulphilas* Bibelübersetzung, p. 4 &c. ed. Weisenfels 1865. 4to. where is condensed, all that is stated of *Uphilas*, and his translation, by the ancients, viz. *Philostorgius*, H. Eccl. L. ii. c. 5. *Socrates*, H. Eccl. L. ii. c. 41. and L. iv. c. 33. *Sozomen*, H. Eccl. L. iv. c. 24. L. vi. c. 37. *Theodoret*, H. Eccles. L. iv. c. 37 and others.—*U'philas*, (or *Ulfila*, *Urphilas*, *Gilfulas*, &c. but should, according to *Jornandes*, be written *Wulfila*. i. e. *Wölflein*, diminutive of *Wulf* or *Wolf*, a wolf,) is said by *Philostorgius*, to have descended from christian Greeks of Sadagoltina in Capadocia, who were carried into captivity by the Goths in the year 266. Others suppose, from his name, that he was of Gothic extract. *Philostorgius* also makes him first bishop of the Goths ; and says, he was ordained by the Arian, *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, in the reign of *Constantine* the Great. Others make him to have succeeded *Theophilus*, and to have flourished from the

§ 22. In the European provinces of the Roman empire, there still remained a vast number of idolaters ; and though the christian bishops endeavored to convert them to *Christ*, the business went on but slowly. In Gaul, the great *Martin*, bishop of Tours, was not unsuccessful in this work ; but travelling through the provinces of Gaul, he by his discourses, and by his miracles, (if we may believe *Sulpitius Severus*,) every where persuaded many to renounce their idols and embrace *Christ* ; and he destroyed their temples, and threw down their statues.(64) He therefore merited the title of the *Apostle of the Gauls*.

§ 23. It is very evident, that the victories of *Constantine* the Great, and both the fear of punishment, and the desire of pleasing the Roman emperors, were cogent reasons, in the view of whole nations as well as of individuals, for embracing the christian religion. Yet no person well informed in the history of this period, will ascribe the extension of christianity wholly to these causes. For it is manifest, that the untiring zeal of the bishops and other holy men, the pure and devout lives which many of the christians exhibited, the translations of the sacred volume, and the excellence of the christian religion, were as efficient motives

year 360, to 380. He was a man of talents and learning, an Arian, (at least in the latter part of his life,) and possessed vast and salutary influence among the Goths in Dacia, Moesia and Thrace. He was at the Arian synod of Constantinople, in the year 359 ; and was twice sent on embassies by the nation to the imperial court. His last embassy was in the reign of *Valens*, AD. 376, to obtain permission for the Goths to pass the Danube and settle in Moesia. He was successful ; and 200,000 Goths were admitted into the Roman empire, on conditions of obeying the Roman laws and joining the Arian interest. It is not known when he died ; but sometime in the reign of *Theodosius* the Great, (AD. 379—395.) he was succeeded in his episcopal office by *Theotimus*, or, as some report, by *Selinas*. He was author of a translation of the whole bible, except the books of Kings, from Greek into the language of the Goths of Moesia. The books of Kings were omitted by him, lest their history of wars and battles should inflame the already too great thirst of the Goths for war and carnage. The alphabet, he used ; was of his own devising, and formed chiefly from the Greek and Latin. Nothing remains of this translation, except a single copy, somewhat mutilated, of the iv Gospels, called the *Codex Argenteus*, because written in letters of silver, now at Upsal in Sweden ; and a few fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, recovered from an erasure of a M. S. of the 8th or 9th century. *Ulphila's* Gospels were first published by *Fr. Junius*, Dort, 1665, 2 vol. 4to : afterwards at Stockholm, 1671, 4to ; and very learnedly, Oxford, 1750. Fol. and lastly, in a very convenient German edition, by *J. C. Zahn*, Weissenfels, 1805. 4to. with a complete Apparatus, in the German language. Tr.]

(64) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. de Vita *Martini*, c. 13, 15, 17. Dial. ii. p. 106 &c. ed. Hier. a Prato, Verona, 1741. Fol.—[This *Martin* was born in Sabaria in Pannonia, and brought up at Pavia in Italy. He embraced christianity, contrary to the will of his parents ; and served in the army, following the occupation of his father. He afterwards left the military life, and committed himself to the instruction of *Hilary* of Poitiers. From the Arians he suffered much persecution ; and he was principally instrumental in the introduction of monasticism among the Gauls. [He was ordained bishop of Tours, AD. 374, and died in the year 397, aged 81.] For other particulars of his life, see his biographer, *Sulpitius Severus* ; also *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tome x ; and the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i Pt. ii. p. 413. Schl.—The English reader may consult *Milner's* church history, Cent. iv. ch. 14. Tr.]

with many persons, as the arguments from worldly advantage and disadvantage were with some others. As for miracles, I cheerfully unite with those who look with contempt on the wonders ascribed to *Paul*, *Antony*, and *Martin*.(65) I also grant, that many events were inconsiderately regarded as miracles, which were according to the laws of nature; not to mention likewise pious frauds. Still I cannot join with such as believe, that in this age, God did never manifest his power by any extraordinary signs among christians.(66)

§ 24. Although the christian church within the Roman empire was involved in no severe calamities, from the times of *Constantine* the Great onwards, except during the commotion of *Licinius* and the short reign of *Julian*, yet slight tempests sometimes beat upon them in certain places. *Athanasius*, for instance, a king of the Goths, fiercely assailed for a time that portion of the Gothic nation which had embraced christianity.(67) In the more remote provinces also, the adherents to idolatry often defended their hereditary superstitions with the sword, and murdered the christians, who in propagating their religion were not always as gentle or as prudent as they ought to have been.(68) Beyond the limits of the Roman empire, *Sapor II.* surnamed *Longaevus*, the king of Persia, waged three bloody wars against the christians in his dominions. The *first* was in the eighteenth year of his reign, [AD. 317.]; the *second* was in the 30th year; and the *third*, which was the most cruel, and destroyed an immense number of christians, commenced in his 31st year, AD. 330, and lasted forty years, or till AD. 370. Yet religion was not the ostensible cause of this dreadful persecution, but a suspicion of treasonable practices among the christians: for the Magi and the Jews persuaded the king to believe, that all christians were in the interests of the Roman empire, and that *Symeon*, the archbishop of Seleucia and

(65) *Hieron. a Prato*, in his preface to *Sulpitius Severus*, p. xiii &c. contends zealously for the miracles of *Martin* and the others in this century. [An account of the miracles of *St. Martin*, may be found in *Sulpit. Sever. Vita Martini*; and Epistles I.—III. and Dialogues II, III. The miracles of some contemporary monks of Egypt and the East, are the subject of Dialogue I. For the history of *Paul*, see *Jerome*, de Vita Sti Pauli Eremitae, in his Opp. tom. i. and for that of *Antony*, see *Athanasius*, de Vita Sti Antonii Eremitae, in his Opp. tom. ii. ed. Paris, 1627. Tr.]

(66) See *Eusebius*, Liber contra Hieroclem, c. iv. p. 431. ed. Olearii; *Henr. Doddwell*, Diss. ii. in Irenaeum, § lv. p. 195. [also *Dr. Conyers Middleton's* Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers, which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church, &c. Lond. 1747. 4to: and in defence of miracles, *Dr. Wm. Doddwell's* Answer to *Dr. Middleton's* Free Inquiry, &c. 1751. 8vo. and *Church's* Vindication of the miraculous powers, in answer to *Middleton*, 1750. 8vo. likewise *Dr. J. Jortin's* Remarks on Eccles. History; vol. i. ed. Lond. 1805. Tr.]

(67) See *Theod. Ruinart*, Acta Martyrum sincera; and among these, the Acta Sti Sabae, p. 598, &c.

(68) See *Ambrose*, de Officiis, Lib. i. c. xlii. § 17; where is a noticeable statement.

Ctesiphon, sent to Constantinople intelligence of all that passed in Persia.(69)

(69) See *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. c. 1—13. [where is a full account]. These Persian persecutions are expressly treated of in the *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* Tom. i. p. 6, 16, 181. and Tom. iii. p. 52 &c. with which however, should be compared *Steph. Euod. Asseman*, Praef. ad *Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.* splendidly edited, Rome, 1748, 2 vol. fol. p. lxxi &c. He has published the *Martyrologium Persicum*, in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and excellent Notes.

CENTURY FOURTH.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. State of literature.—§ 2. Progress of the Platonic philosophy.—§ 3. Its fate.—§ 4. State of learning among christians.—§ 5. Many illiterate christians.

§ 1. The Greeks and Romans of this century, who wished to pass for the *literati* of the age, devoted themselves particularly to eloquence, poetry, and history, among the fine arts. And not a few of both nations might be named, who acquired some reputation in these arts. Yet they all fell very far short of the highest excellence. The best of these poets, as *Ausonius*,⁽¹⁾ if compared with those of the Augustan age, are harsh and inelegant. The rhetoricians, abandoning wholly the noble simplicity and majesty of the ancients, taught the youth how to speak ostentatiously and deceptively on all subjects. And most of the historians were less attentive to method, perspicuity, and fidelity, than to empty and insipid ornaments.

§ 2. Nearly all who attempted philosophy in this century, were of the sect called Modern Platonists. It is not strange therefore, that some Platonic notions are to be met with in the works of the christians, as well as others. Yet there were fewer philosophers in the West, than in the East. In Syria, *Jamblichus* of Chalcis expounded Plato, or rather palmed his own conceptions upon that

(1) [*Decius*, or *Decimus*, *Magnus Ausonius*, was a Latin poet, well born and educated at Bordeaux, who flourished in the last half of this century. He was probably a nominal christian, was a man of poetic genius, and much caressed and advanced to high honors by those in authority. His poems were chiefly short pieces, Eulogies, Epigrams, &c. and not devoid of merit. Yet the style attests the declining age of Roman literature. Some of the pieces are also very obscene. Edited by *Tollius*, Lugd. B. 1671. 4to: and Lat. and Fr. by *Joubert*, Paris, 1769, 4 vol. 12mo. *Tr.*]

philosopher.(2) His writings show, that he was superstitious, cloudy, credulous, and of ordinary intellectual powers. He was succeeded by *Aedesius*,(3) *Maximus*,(4) and others; of whose follies *Eunapius* gives us an account. In Egypt, *Hypatia*,(5) a distinguished lady, *Isidorus*,(6) *Olympiodorus*,(7) *Synesius* a semi-christian,(8) and others of less fame, propagated this kind of wisdom, or rather, folly.

§ 3. As the emperor *Julian* was a passionate admirer of this philosophy, (as his writings clearly show,) very many were induced by his influence, to vie with each other in their endeavors to set it forth in the most alluring dress.(9) But when *Julian* died, a dreadful storm burst upon the Platonists, during the reign of

(2) [*Jamblichus*. There were three of this name; the first lived early in the second century; his works are now lost: the second probably died about the year 333, and wrote largely; the third was contemporary with *Julian*, and wrote the life of *Alypius* the musician. The second is the one intended by *Dr. Mosheim*. He was a pagan, an enthusiast, and a great pretender to superior talents and learning. Of his works, there remain, a Life of *Pythagoras*, published Gr. and Lat. with Notes by *Kuster*, Amstelod. 1707. 4to;—Exhortation to the study of Philosophy; Three Books on mathematical learning; Commentary on *Nicomachus*; Institutes of Arithmetic; and a Treatise on the Mysteries of the Egyptians and Chaldeans of Assyria; published Gr. and Lat. with Notes, by *Tho. Gale*, Oxon. 1678. Fol. See *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos. tom. ii. p. 260—270. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. iv. p. 252 &c. and *Lardner's Works*, vol viii. Tr.]

(3) [*Aedesius* of Cappadocia, a disciple of *Jamblichus*, and like his master, a devotee of theurgia. See *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos. tom. ii. p. 270 &c. Tr.]

(4) [*Maximus* of Ephesus, called the Cynic, another pretender to super-human knowledge. He is said to have persuaded *Julian* to apostatize; and he certainly had great influence over that emperor. He was put to death, for practising magic, in the reign of *Vulens*. See *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos. Tom. ii. 281, &c. *Eunapius*, (de Vitis Sophistarum,) gives account of *Jamblichus*, *Aedesius*, and *Maximus*. Tr.]

(5) [*Hypatia* of Alexandria, a lady who excelled all the philosophers of her age, and who publicly taught philosophy with great applause, flourished in the close of this century, and the first part of the next. She was murdered in a tumult, AD. 415. See *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 15. *Suidas*, Art. Hypatia, tom iii. p. 533. *Tillemont*, Memoires, &c. a l' Histoire Eccles. tom. xiv. p. 274. *Menage*, Hist. mulier. philosoph. § 49 &c. p. 494 &c. and *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos. Tom. ii. p. 351. Tr.]

(6) [This *Isidorus* was surnamed *Gazaeus*, from Gaza in Palestine the place of his birth. Concerning him, see *Brucher*, Hist. crit. Philos. tom. ii. p. 341 &c. Schl.]

(7) [*Olympiodorus*, author of a Commentary upon Plato, still preserved in M. S. at Paris; and a Life of Plato, of which a Latin version has been published. There were several persons of this name. See *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos. Tom. ii. p. 490. Tr.]

(8) *Synesius*, of Cyrene in Africa, studied under *Hypatia*; resided at Constantinople from AD. 397—400, as deputy from his native city; was made bishop of *Ptolemais* AD. 410. He wrote well for that age; though he was too much infected with the reigning philosophy. His works, as edited by *Petavius*, Gr. and Lat. Paris 1612, and 1631. fol. are de Regno, ad Arcadium Imperatorem;—Dio, vel de ipsius vitae instituto;—Calvitii encomium; Aegyptius, sive de Providentia; de Insomniis; Epistolae clv; and several Discourses, and Hymns. Tr.]

(9) See *Ez. Spanheim*, Praefatio ad Opp. *Juliani*, et ad versionem Gallicam *Caesarum Juliani*, p. iii. et Adnotat. p. 234. *Bletterie*, Vie de l' Empereur *Julien*, Liv. i. p. 26 &c.

Va'entinian; and several of them were arraigned and tried for their lives, on the charge of practising magic, and other crimes. In these commotions, *Maximus*, the preceptor of *Julian*, among others, suffered death.(10) But it was rather the intimacy of these men with *Julian*, whose counsellors they had been, than the philosophy they embraced, that proved their ruin. Hence the rest of the sect, which had not been connected with the court, were exposed to very little danger or loss, in this persecution of the philosophers.

§ 4. The christians, from the times of *Constantine* the Great, devoted much more attention to the study of philosophy and the liberal arts, than they had done before. And the emperors omitted no means which might awaken and cherish a thirst for learning. Schools were established in many of the towns; libraries were formed, and literary men were encouraged by stipends, by privileges, and by honors.(11) All this was requisite to the accomplishment of their object of gradually abolishing pagan idolatry: for the old religion of the pagans derived its chief support from the learning of its advocates: and moreover, if the christian youth could find no instructors of their own religion, there was danger of their applying to the pagan teachers of philosophy and rhetoric, to the injury of the true religion.

§ 5. Yet it must not be supposed, that the christian church was full of literary, wise, and scientific men. For there was no law as yet, to prevent the ignorant and illiterate from entering the sacred office; and it appears from explicit testimony, that there were both bishops and presbyters, entirely destitute of all science and learning. Besides, the party was both numerous and powerful, who considered all learning, and especially philosophical learning, as injurious and even destructive to true piety and godliness. All the *ascetics*, *monks*, and *eremites*, were inclined towards this party; which was also highly favored, not only by women, but by all those who estimate piety by the sanctity of the countenance, the sordidness of the dress, and the love of solitude, that is, by the many.

(10) *Ammianus Marcellin*. *Histor. Lib. xxix. c. 1. p. 556. ed. Valesii*: and *Bletteris*, *Vie de Julien*, p. 30 &c. 155, 159 &c; and *Vie de Jovien*, tome i. p. 194.

(11) See *Ja. Godfrey*, on the *Codex Theodos. Titles, de Professoribus et Artibus liberalibus*; *Fran. Balduin*, *Constantinus Magn. p. 122, &c. Herm. Conringius*, *Diss. de studiis Romae et Constantinop. subjoined to his Antiquitatt. Academicæ*.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND OF ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. Form of the Christian church.—§ 3. conformed to the civil establishment.
—§ 4. Administration, internal and external, of the church.—§ 5. Rank of
the bishop of Rome.—§ 6. Limits of his jurisdiction.—§ 7. The bishop of
Constantinople.—§ 8. Vices of the clergy.—§ Distinguished writers in the
Greek church.—§ 10. Principal writers in the Latin church.

§ 1. *Constantine* the Great let the form and organization of the church remain, substantially, as had been; yet he attempted in some respects to improve and extend it. While therefore, he suffered the church to continue to be, as before, a sort of republic within, yet distinct from, the political body, he assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred republic; and the right of modelling and controlling it, in such a manner as would best subserve the public good. Nor did any bishop call in question this power of the emperor. The people, therefore, in the same manner as before, continued to elect their own bishops and teachers: and the bishops severally in their respective districts or cities, directed and regulated all ecclesiastical affairs, using their presbyters as their council, and calling on the people for their assent. The bishops also met together in conventions or councils, to deliberate on the subjects in which the churches of a whole province were interested, on points of religious controversy, on the forms and rites of worship, and others of like import. To these minor councils of one or more provinces, there were now added, by authority of the emperor, assemblies or grand councils of the whole church, called *oecumenical* or *general councils*, the emperor having first summoned one of this character at *Nice*. For he judged it to be suitable, (and it is probable he was in this supported by the opinions of the bishops,) that causes of great moment, and affecting the church universally or the general principles of christianity, should be examined and decided in conventions of the whole church. There were never, indeed, any councils held, which could strictly and properly be called *universal*: those however, whose decrees and enactments were received and approved by the whole church, or by the greatest part of it, have been commonly called *oecumenical* or *general councils*.

§ 2. Most of these rights and privileges, however, were gradually incroached upon, and very much diminished, from the

time that various disturbances and quarrels and threatening contests arose here and there respecting ecclesiastical affairs, religious doctrines, or the elections of bishops. For, as the weaker parties generally appealed to the court, this afforded to the emperors the best opportunity of encroaching on the power of the bishops and the liberties of the people, and of variously changing the ancient customs of the church. The bishops likewise, whose wealth and influence were not a little augmented, from the times of *Constantine*, gradually subverted and changed the ancient principles of church government. For they first excluded the people altogether from having a voice in ecclesiastical affairs; and next deprived the *presbyters* of their former authority; so that they now controlled every thing at their discretion, and in particular appropriated the ecclesiastical property to themselves, or distributed it as they pleased. Hence, at the close of this century, only the shadow of the ancient form of church government remained; and the former rights of the presbyters and the people were engrossed chiefly by the bishops; while those of the whole church were transferred to the emperors or to their provincial governors and magistrates.

§ 3. *Constantine*, to render his throne secure and prevent civil wars, not only changed the system of Roman laws, but likewise altered in many respects the disposition and divisions of the commonwealth.(1) And as he wished, for various reasons, to adapt the ecclesiastical administration to that of the commonwealth, it became necessary that new grades of honor and pre-eminence should be introduced among the bishops. The princes among the bishops, were those who had before held a preeminent rank, namely, the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria; with whom the bishop of Constantinople was joined, after the imperial residence was transferred to that city. These four prelates answered to the four *praetorian prefects*, created by *Constantine*; and, perhaps even in this century, bore the Jewish title of *Patriarchs*. Next to these were the *exarchs*, corresponding with the civil *exarchs*, and presiding each over several provinces. The *metropolitans* came next, who governed only single provinces. After them ranked the *archbishops*, who had the inspection only of certain districts of country. The *bishops* brought up the rear; whose territories were not in all countries of the same extent, being in some countries more extensive, and in others confined to narrower limits. To these several orders of bishops, I should add that of the *chorepiscopi*, or *rural bishops*, the superintendants of the country or suburbial churches, were it not that

(1) See *Bos*, Hist. de la Monarchie Française, tom. i. p. 64. *Giannone*, Hist. de Naples, tom. i. p. 94, 152.

the bishops, in order to extend their own power, had caused this order to be suppressed in most places.(2)

(2) This is shown by *Ludov. Thomassinus*, *Disciplina eccles. vet. et nova circa beneficia*, tom. i. various passages.—[Though the ecclesiastical divisions of the Roman empire, did not coincide exactly with the civil divisions, yet a knowledge of the latter will help us to form a better idea of the former. Accordingly, we annex the following account of the civil distribution copied from an ancient *Notitia Imperii*, said to have been written before the reign of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*, or before A.D. 395. See *Pagi Critica* in *Barronii Annal.* ad. Ann. 37. tom. i. p. 29 &c.]

I. *Praefectus Praetorio Orientis*: et sub eo Dioeceses quinque, ss.

1. Dioecesis orientis, in qua Provinciae xv. nempe, Palaestina, Phoenice, Syria, Cilicia, Cyprus, Arabia, Isauria, Palaestina Salutaris, Palaestina II. Phoenice Libani, Euphratensis, Syria Salutaris, Osrhoëna, Mesopotamia, et Cilicia ii.

2. Dioecesis Aegypti, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Libia superior, Libya inferior, Thebais, Aegyptus, Arcadia, et Augustanica.

3. Dioecesis Asiae, in qua Provinciae x. nempe, Pamphylia, Hellespontus, Lydia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Phrygia Pacatiana, Phrygia Salutaris, Lycia, Caria, et Insulae.

4. Dioecesis Ponti, in qua Provinciae x. nempe, Galatia, Bithynia, Honorias, Cappadocia I. Paphlagonia, Pontus Polemoniacus, Helenopontus, Armenia I. Arinenia II. et Galatia Salutaris.

5. Dioecesis Thraciae, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Europa, Thracia, Hemimontis, Rhodope, Moesia ii. et Scythia.

II. *Praefectus Praetorio Illyrici*: et sub eo Dioeceses duae, ss.

1. Dioecesis Macedoniae, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Achaia, Macedonia, Creta, Thessalia, Epirus vetus, et Epirus nova.

2. Dioecesis Daciae, in qua Provinciae v. nempe, Dacia Mediterranea, Dacia Ripensis, Moesia prima, Dardania Praevalitiana, et Pars Macedoniae Salutaris.

III. *Praefectus Praetorio Italiae*: et sub eo Dioeceses tres, ss.

1. Dioecesis Italiae, in qua Provinciae xvii. nempe, Venetiae, Aemilia, Liguria, Flaminia et Picenum Annonarium, Tuscia et Umbria, Picenum Suburbicarium, Campania, Sicilia, Apulia et Calabria, Lucania et Brutii, Alpes Cottiarum, Rhaetia prima, Rhaetia secunda, Samnium, Valeria, Sardinia, et Corsica.

2. Dioecesis Illyrici, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Pannonia secunda, Savia, Dalmatia, Pannonia secunda, Noricum Mediterraneum, et Noricum Ripense.

3. Dioecesis Africae, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Byzacium, Numidia, Mauritania Sitifensis, Mauritania Caesariensis, Tripolis, et Africa Proconsularis.

IV. *Praefectus Praetorio Galliarum*: et sub eo Dioeceses tres, ss.

1. Dioecesis Hispaniae, in qua Provinciae vii. nempe, Boetica, Lusitania, Gallaecia, Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Tingitania, et Balears.

2. Dioecesis Galliarum, in qua Provinciae xvii. nempe, Viennensis, Lugdunensis i. Germania i. Germania ii. Belgica i. Belgica ii. Alpes Maritimae, Alpes Penninae et Graiae, Maxima Sequanorum, Aquitania i. Aquitania ii. Novempopuli, Narbonensis i. Narbonensis ii. Lugdunensis ii. Lugdunensis iii. et Lugdunensis Senonia.

3. Dioecesis Britanniarum, in qua Provinciae v. nempe, Maxima Caesariensis, Valentia, Britannia i. Britannia ii. et Flavia Caesariensis.

Thus the civil division of the Roman empire was, in this century, into iv. Prefectures, containing 13 Dioceses, which embraced 116 Provinces. The ecclesiastical division of the empire, though founded upon the civil division, was by no means so complete and so regular. The civil provinces were generally ecclesiastical provinces, and under the inspection severally of the metropolitans or archbishops of those provinces. Yet there were many bishops, who were exempt from the inspection or jurisdiction of the metropolitans, and were therefore called *ἀυτοκέφαλοι independent*. They also bore the titles of archbishops and of metropolitans; although they had no suffragans, or bishops depending on them. Above the rank of metropolitans, there were properly none other than the patriarchs. For the exarchs of Asia, Capadocia, and Pontus, were only the first metropolitans of those civil Dioceses, while they belonged to no patriarchate. And the primates of certain countries, in after ages, were only the metropolitans that ranked first, or had precedence, among the metropolitans of their respective countries.—Hence there were not properly five orders of bishops, above the rank of chorepiscopi, as *Dr. Mosheim* represents; but only three, namely, patriarchs,

§ 4. The administration of ecclesiastical affairs, was divided by *Constantine* into the *external* and the *internal*.⁽³⁾ The latter, he relinquished to the bishops and to councils. It embraced whatever was purely religious, religious controversies, forms of worship, functions of the priests, the irregularities of their lives, &c. The *external* administration he took upon himself. It included whatever relates to the external condition of the church, or to its discipline, and also all contests and causes of the ministers of the church, both of the higher and of the lower orders,

metropolitans or *archbishops*, and simple *bishops*.—Before the times of *Constantine*, provincial councils were common; and these gave rise to the order of *metropolitans*. Among the metropolitans, those of *Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria* stood preeminent, in honor and influence. During the reign of *Constantine the Great*, the powers of these three *metropolitans* were enlarged; but whether they bore the title, or possessed the authority, of *patriarchs*, at that time, is not certain. They however became *patriarchs*, both in name and in power, before a century had elapsed. And these were the three original patriarchs. Towards the close of this century, the bishops of *Constantinople* obtained rank next to those of *Rome*, and extended their authority over several Dioceses not subject to the other patriarchs. In the next century, the bishops of *Jerusalem* became independent of the patriarchs of *Antioch*; and thus there were five patriarchates formed. Their respective limits were as follows. The patriarchal authority of the bishops of *Rome*, did not at first extend beyond Italy, perhaps not over the whole of that. For the bishops of *Africa*, *Spain*, *Gaul*, *Britain*, and *Illyricum*, acknowledged no ecclesiastical head or ruler, except their own metropolitans. But after the dissolution of the western empire, the bishop of *Rome* found means to bring all the bishops and metropolitans of the West under his authority. This he justified, partly by claiming to be patriarch of all the West, and partly by virtue of his assumed supremacy over the whole church. The patriarchs of *Constantinople* claimed dominion over the civil Dioceses of *Asia*, *Pontus*, and *Thrace*, which belonged to the prefecture of the East, and also over the two Dioceses composing the prefecture of *Illyricum*. No one of these dioceses had before belonged to any patriarchate; the three former having been governed by provincial councils, in which the metropolitans of *Ephesus*, *Caesarea* in *Cappadocia*, and *Heraclea* in *Thrace*, had the precedence of all other metropolitans. The two other Dioceses, those of *Macedonia* and *Dacia*, had been governed in a similar manner; and being afterwards claimed by the bishops of *Rome*, were the cause of long and violent contests between these ambitious prelates. But the patriarchs of *Constantinople* retained them, and thereby extended their dominions northward over the *Russian* empire. The patriarchate of *Antioch* embraced, originally, the whole Diocese of the East, and likewise extended over the churches beyond the limits of the *Roman* empire in *Asia*, quite to *India*. But in the year 451, the patriarchate of *Jerusalem* was created out of it, embracing the whole of *Palaestina* i. ii. and iii. or *Salutaris*, and thence to mount *Sinai* and the borders of *Egypt*. The patriarchate of *Alexandria* embraced the civil Diocese of *Egypt*; and thence extended into *Abyssinia*.—Such were the territorial limits of the five patriarchates, from the 5th century onward to the reformation. In the 11th century, *Nilus Doxopatrius*, of *Constantinople*, gives them substantially the same boundaries. From him we learn, that the patriarch of *Constantinople* then presided over 52 metropolitans, who had under them 649 suffragan bishops; and over 13 titular metropolitans, i. e. bishops who were called metropolitans and *ἀντοκέφαλοι*, but had no suffragans; and likewise 34 titular archbishops. The patriarch of *Antioch* presided over 13 metropolitans, with 139 suffragans, besides 8 titular metropolitans, and 13 titular archbishops. The patriarch of *Jerusalem* presided over 4 metropolitans with suffragans, and 25 titular archbishops. And the patriarch of *Alexandria* presided over 7 metropolitans with suffragans, and 5 titular metropolitans and archbishops. The number of suffragans in the two last Patriarchates is not given. *Tr.*]

(3) *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini Magn. Lib. iv. c. 24.

which did not respect religion and sacred functions, but property, worldly honors, and privileges, and offences against the laws, and the like.(4) He therefore, and his successors, assembled councils, presided in them, assigned judges for religious disputes, decided contests between bishops and their people, determined the limits of the episcopal sees, and by the ordinary judges, heard and adjudged the civil causes and common offences among the ministers of the church; but the ecclesiastical causes he left to the cognizance of the councils and bishops. Yet this famous partition of the ecclesiastical government into the *external* and the *internal* administrations, was never clearly explained and accurately defined. Hence, both in this and in the following centuries, we see many transactions which do not accord with it but contravene it. For the emperors not unfrequently, determined matters relating to the interior of the church: and, on the other hand, councils and bishops often enacted laws respecting things which seem to belong to the external form and affairs of the church.

§ 5. The first among the bishops, in respect to rank and dignity, was the bishop of Rome. And this preeminence was not founded solely on popular feeling and prejudice, of long standing, and which various causes had given rise to; but also on those grounds, which commonly give priority and greatness in the estimation of mortals. For he exceeded all other bishops, in the amplitude and splendor of the church over which he presided, in the magnitude of his revenues and possessions, in the number of his assistants or ministers of various descriptions, in the weight of his influence with the people at large, and in the sumptuousness and magnificence of his style of living.(5) These indications of power and worldly greatness were so fascinating to the minds of christians even in this age, that often most obstinate and bloody contests took place at Rome, when a new pontiff was to be created by the suffrages of the priests and people. A shocking example of this is afforded by the disturbance at Rome in the year 366, after the death of *Liberius*. When they came to the choice of a new bishop, one party was for placing *Damasus*, and another for appointing *Ursicinus*, a deacon, over the widowed church: and the contention issued in a bloody warfare, in which there was fighting, burning of buildings, and many lost their lives. *Damasus* came off victorious in the contest; but whether his claims were better, or his cause more righteous, than those of

(4) See the imperial laws, in both the *Justinian* and *Theodosian* Codex; and, among others, *Ja. Godfrey*, ad Codicem Theodos. tom. vi. p. 55, 58, 333 &c. [This whole system resulted, in part, from the office of *Pontifex Maximus*, which was retained by Constantine and all his successors, till into the fifth century; and, in part, from the conception of *Constantine*, that the church was a society existing independently of the state. See *Boss*, Diss. de Pontificatu maximo Imperator. Christianor. Schl.]

(5) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Hist. L. xxvii. c. 3.

Ursicinus, does not appear.(6) I dare not pronounce either of them a good man.

§ 6. It is however abundantly attested, that the bishops of Rome did not, in this age, possess supreme power and jurisdiction in the church. They were citizens of the common wealth; and though higher in honor, they obeyed the laws and the mandates of the emperors, just like other citizens. The more weighty religious causes were determined, either by judges appointed by the emperor, or in ecclesiastical councils; minor causes were decided by individual bishops. The laws relating to religion, were enacted either by the emperors or by councils. No one of the bishops acknowledged, that his authority was derived from the plenary power of the Roman bishop, or that he was constituted a bishop *by the favor of the apostolic see*. On the contrary, they all maintained, that they were the ambassadors and ministers of *Jesus Christ*, and that their authority was derived from above.(7) Yet it is undeniable, that even in this age, several of those steps were laid, by which the Roman pontiffs afterwards mounted to the summit of ecclesiastical dominion; and this, partly by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the sagacity of the pontiffs themselves, and partly by the hasty decisions of certain bishops. Among these steps however, I would assign either no place, or only the very last, to the *fourth canon* of the council of *Sardica*, in the year 347, to which the friends of the Roman pontiff assign the *first* and the most important place. For, not to mention that the authority and regularity of this council are very dubious, and that, not without reason, the enactments of this council are regarded by some as coming to us corrupted, and by others as forged;(8) it cannot be made to appear from that canon, that the

(6) See the writers of *Lives of the Popes*, among whom *Arch. Bower* has stated this matter ingenuously and impartially, in his *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 180 &c. ed. 2. Lond. 1749. [*Ammian. Marcellin. Hist. L. xxvii. c. 3.* says, that 137 corpses of the slain, were found in one day, in the church of *Sicinius*. *Tr.*]

(7) All these points are discussed at large, by many writers, among whom I will name *Peter de Marca*, de *Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*; *L. E. du Pin*, de *antiqua ecclesiae Disciplina*; and especially, *Duo. Blondell*, de la *Primauté dans l'Eglise*,—a very learned work: [also *Fred. Spanheim*, *Diss. de Primatu Papae, et Canone vi. Nicaeno*. *Schl.*—The sixth canon of the council of *Nice*, AD. 325, gave to the bishops of *Alexandria*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*, severally, the same pre-eminence over their respective surrounding bishops. *Meletius* had encroached upon the prerogatives of his metropolitan of *Alexandria*: and therefore the council ordain, (according to the translation of *Dionysius Exiguus*,) *Antiqua consuetudo servetur per Aegyptum, Libyam, et Pentapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem; quia et Romae Episcopo parilis mos est. Similiter autem et apud Antiochiam, caeterasque provincias, suis privilegia serventur ecclesiis*. To reconcile this canon with the papal claims of universal empire, the Romanists tell us, it relates merely to the patriarchal or metropolitan power of the bishop of Rome, and not to his power as *pope*:—a distinction, which does not appear to have occurred to the Nicene fathers. See *Natalis Alexander*, *Hist. Eccles. cent. iv. Dissert. xx.* *Tr.*]

(8) See *Mich. Geddes*, *Diss. de Canonibus Sardicensibus*; among his *Miscel-*

bishops assembled at Sardica decided, that in all cases, an appeal might be made to the Roman pontiff, as the supreme and final judge. But suppose they had so decided—which yet can never be proved—how weak must that right be, which is founded only on the decision of a single obscure council.(9)

§ 7. *Constantine* the Great, by transferring the imperial residence to Byzantium, and there founding the new city of Constantinople, undesignedly raised up against the rising power of the Roman pontiff, a powerful competitor, in the bishop of the new metropolis. For as the emperor wished his *Constantinople* to be a *new Rome*, and had endowed it with all the privileges and honors and elegancies of old Rome; the bishop of so great a city, which was the imperial residence, also wished to be thought every way equal to the bishop of old Rome in rank, and to have precedence of all other bishops. Nor did the emperors disapprove of this ambition, because they considered their own dignity as involved in that of the bishop of their metropolis. Therefore in the council of Constantinople, assembled in the year 381, by authority of the emperor *Theodosius* the Great, the bishop of Alexandria not being present, and the bishop of Rome being opposed to it, the bishop of Constantinople was, by the third canon, placed in the first rank after the bishop of Rome; the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, of course, to take rank after him. The bishop who had this honor conferred on him, was *Nectarius*. His successor, *John Chrysostom* went farther, and subjected all Thrace, Asia, [the Diocese of the western part of Asia Minor,] and Pontus to his jurisdiction.(10) The subsequent bishops of

laneous Tracts, vol. ii. p. 415; [and *Arch. Bower*, Lives of the Popes,—Pope *Julian*, vol. i. p. 420 &c. ed. 2. Lond. 1749. 4to. Tr.]

(9) [This council was got up by *Julius*, bishop of Rome; and was designed to be a *general* council, and was therefore held at *Sardica* in Illyricum, as accommodating both the East and the West; but as most of the eastern bishops withdrew from it, it was rather a council of the West. Its decrees were not confirmed by several subsequent councils, nor received by the whole church. See *de Marca*, de Concordia Sacerdotii &c. Lib. vii. c. 4, 5, 11, 12, 15. By the 3d canon in the *Greek*, or the 4th in the *Latin* translation by *Isidorus*, it was ordered, that if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, and wish for a new trial, his judges shall acquaint the bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order a new trial before such of the neighboring bishops as he may choose to name. The 4th Canon, according to the *Greek*, adds, that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant, till the determination of the bishop of Rome is known. By the 5th Canon, according to the *Greek*, and the 7th of *Isidorus*, it is ordered, that if a condemned bishop apply to Rome for relief, the bishop of Rome may, if he see fit, not only order a new trial, but if the aggrieved bishop desire it, he may send one of his presbyters to sit and have a voice in the second trial. See *de Marca*, loc. cit. cap. 3.—Thus these canons do not give the bishop of Rome even an *appellate jurisdiction*, but only the power to decide whether an injured bishop shall have a *new trial*. Tr.]

(10) See *Peter de Marca*, Diss. de Constantinop. Patriarchatus institutione; annexed to his work, de Concordia sacerdotii et imperii, vol. iv. p. 163 &c. ed. Bamb. 1789. *Mich. Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 15 &c. *Sam. Parker*, An account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six

Constantinople gradually advanced their claims still farther. But this revolution in the ecclesiastical government, and the sudden elevation of the Byzantine bishop to high rank, to the injury of others, in the first place fired the Alexandrine prelates with resentment against those of Constantinople; and in the next place, gave rise to those unhappy contests between the pontiffs of old and new Rome, which were protracted through several centuries, with various success, and finally produced a separation between the Latin and the Greek churches.

§ 8. The vices and the faults of the clergy, especially of those who officiated in large and opulent cities, were augmented in proportion to the increase of their wealth, honors, and advantages, derived from the emperors and from various other sources: and that this increase was very great, after the times of *Constantine*, is acknowledged by all. The *bishops* had shameful quarrels among themselves, respecting the boundaries of their sees and the extent of their jurisdiction; and, while they trampled on the rights of the people and of the inferior clergy, they vied with the civil governors of provinces, in luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness.(11) The *presbyters*, in many places, assumed an equality with bishops, in point of rank and authority. Of the pride and effeminacy of the *deacons*, we often meet with various complaints. Those especially who ranked first among the presbyters and deacons, were unwilling to be considered as belonging to the same order with the others; and therefore, they not only assumed the titles of *archpresbyters* and *archdeacons*, but they thought themselves authorized to assume far greater liberties, than were allowed to others.

§ 9. Among the eminent writers of this century, who were an ornament to the eastern provinces and to Greece, the most distinguished were those whose names here follow. *Eusebius Pamphili*, bishop of Cesarea in Palestine, a man of vast reading and erudition, and one who has acquired immortal fame, by his labors in ecclesiastical history, and in other branches of theological learning. Yet he was not free from errors and defects: he leaned towards the side of those who think there is subordination among the three persons in the Godhead. Some rank him among the *Arians*; but they certainly err in so doing, if they intend by an Arian, one who embraces the opinions taught by *Arius* the

hundred years, p. 245. Lond. 1683. 8vo. [The canon of the council was thus expressed: "Constantinopolitanae civitatis Episcopum habere oportet primatus honorem post Romanum Episcopum, *propterea quòd sit nova Roma.*" Tr.]

(11) See *Sulpitius Severus*, *Historia Sacra*, Lib. i. c. 23. Lib. ii. c. 32, 51. *Dialog.* i. c. 21. Add to this, the account given by *David Clarkson*, in his *Discourse on Liturgies*, p. 228, (of the French edition,) of the extremely corrupt state of morals among the clergy: and, in particular, of the eagerness of the bishops to extend the boundaries of their authority, p. 150 &c.

presbyter of Alexandria: (12) *Peter*, bishop of Alexandria, who

(12) No one has, with more zeal and learning, accused *Eusebius* of Arianism, than *Joh. Le Clerc*, in his *Epistolae Ecclesiast.* annexed to his *Ars Critica*, Ep. ii. p. 30 &c. To him, add *Natalis Alexander*, *Hist. Eccles. N. Test. Saec. iv. Diss. xvii.* All, however, that these and others labor to prove is, that *Eusebius* thought there was some disparity and a subordination among the persons of the Godhead. And suppose this to have been his opinion, it will not follow that he was an *Arian*, unless the term be taken in a very extensive and improper sense. It is to be lamented, that so many abuse this term, and apply it to persons, who, though in error, are very far from holding the opinions of *Arius*.—[*Eusebius Pamphili* (ss. *amicus*, φ λος.) was born, probably, about the year 270, and at *Cesarea*, where he spent nearly all his life. Till about 40 years of age, he lived in great intimacy with the martyr *Pamphy'us*, a learned and devout man of *Cesarea*, and founder of an extensive library there, from which *Eusebius* derived his vast stores of learning. *Pamphy'us* was two years in prison, during which *Eusebius* was constantly with him. After the martyrdom of his friend, in the year 309, *Eusebius* fled first to *Tyre*, and thence to *Egypt*, where he lived till the persecution subsided. After his return to *Cesarea*, about the year 314, he was made bishop of his own city. In the year 325, he attended the council of *Nice*, was appointed to deliver the address to the emperor on his entering the council, and then to be seated at his right hand. The first draft of the *Nicene creed* was made by him; to which however, the term ἡμεῖς and the *anathemas* were added by the council, and not without some scruples on the part of *Eusebius*. Afterwards *Eusebius* appeared to belong to a moderate party, who could not go all lengths with either side. About the year 330, he was offered the patriarchal chair of *Antioch*; which he refused, because the ancient customs forbid the removal of bishops from one see to another. He died about the year 340.—The opinion advanced by *Dr. Mosheim*, respecting the Arianism of *Eusebius*, is supported at length, by *Socrates*, among the ancients, *Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 21.* and by *W. Cave*, in his *Diss. de Eusebii Caesarien. Arianismo*, adv. *Joh. Clericum*; and in his *Epistola apologet. ad eundem*; both are annexed to his *Historia literar. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.*—Of the numerous works of *Eusebius*, the following have been preserved.

1. *Chronicon*: originally in two parts; the *first*, a brief history of the origin and revolutions of all nations; and the *second*, a full chronological table of the same events. Little of the original Greek remains; but we have the Latin translation of the *second* part, by *Jerome*; which, with what could be gleaned of the Greek, and considerable additions from other ancient chroniclers, was published by *Jos. Scaliger*, 1606. Fol. and a 2d ed. by *Morus*, 1658.

2. *Praeparatio Evangelica*, in xv Books; intended to prepare the minds of pagans to embrace christianity, by showing, that the pagan religions are absurd, and far less worthy to be received than the christian. It is a learned and valuable work; published Gr. and Lat. by *F. Vigcrus*, Paris 1628. Fol. and again, Cologne (Leipsic) 1688.

3. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in xx Books, of which the last x are lost. This is an attempt to demonstrate the truth of the christian religion, by arguments drawn from the O. Test, and was therefore intended especially for the Jews. It is far less valuable than the former. Ed. Paris 1628, and Cologne 1688. Fol.

4. *Contra Hieroclem Liber*; in defence of christianity, against the attack of that pagan philosopher. See the article *Hierocles*, supra, pa. 270. note (45). It is published Gr. and Lat. annexed to the *Demonstratio Evang.* and by *Godf. Olearius*, with the works of the two *Philostratus*, Lips. 1709. Fol.

5. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in x Books, from the birth of *Christ*, to the death of *Licinius* in 324. A most valuable treasure; though less full and complete, than could be wished. *Eusebius* was an impartial historian, and had access to the best helps for composing a correct history, which his age afforded. See *Ch. Aug. Kestner*, *Commentatio de Eusebii Historiae Eccles. conditoris Auctoritate et Fide diplomatica, sive de ejus Fontibus et Ratione, qua eis usus est*; Gotting. 1816. 4to.—This work, with the three following, was best edited Gr. and Lat. by *Valesius*, Paris 1659. and 1671. Amsterd. 1695, and with improvements by *W. Reading*, Cambridge, 1720, 3 vol. Fol.—including the other Gr. Ecclesiastical historians; namely, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, *Evagrius*, *Theodorus Lector*,

is highly extolled by *Eusebius*.(13) *Athanasius*, bishop of Alexandria, famous, among other writings and acts, for his very strenuous opposition to the Arians.(14) *Basil*, surnamed the *Great*,

and *Philostorgius*. Those of Euseb. Socrat. Sozom. and Evag. with the three following works, were translated into English, Cambr. 1683. 1 vol. Fol.

6. *De Martyribus Palaestinae* Liber: usually appended to the eighth Book of his Hist. Eccles. It gives account of the sufferers in the East and in Egypt, during the persecution of *Diocletian*, or AD. 303—313.

7. *De Vita Constantini Magni*, Libri iv; a panegyric, rather than a biography.

8. *Oratio de Laudibus Constantini*; delivered on the emperor's vicennalia, AD. 335.

9. *Contra Marcellum*, Libri ii; composed by order of the council of Constantinople, 336, by which Marcellus was condemned as a Sabellian: annexed, Gr. and Lat. to the Paris edition of the Praep. Evang. 1628.

10. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* Libri iii. This also is in confutation of Marcellus' opinions; and is printed, with the former, Gr. and Lat. subjoined to the Praep. Evang.

11. *De Locis Hebraicis*; a kind of Biblical Gazetteer of Palestine: edited with the Latin translation of *Jerome*, by *Bonfrerius*, Paris 1631.

12. *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*; ed. by *Meursius*, Leyden, 1617. 4to.

13. *Vitae Prophetarum*, ascribed to *Euseb*. Gr. and Lat. Paris 1580. Fol. with the Comment of *Procopius* in *Isaiam*.

14. *Canones sacrorum Evangeliorum*: tables, showing what portions of the Gospel History are narrated by one, by two, by three, or by four Evangelists. The Latin translation of *Jerome* was published in the *Orthodoxographia*, in the Works of *Jerome*, and in *Biblioth. Patrum*.

15. *Apologiae pro Origene* Liber primus; (the other five Books are wholly lost;) the Latin translation of this, by *Ruffinus*, is published among the works of *Jerome*.

16. *Commentarii in Psalmos* cl. (but all beyond Ps. 119. is lost,) published Gr. and Lat. by *Montfaucon*, Collect. Nov. Gr. Patrum, tom. 1. Paris 1706. Fol.

17. *Commentarii in Isaiam*; ed. Gr. and Lat. by *Montfaucon*, ubi supra, tom. ii.

18. *Fourteen Latin Essays or Discourses*, against Sabellianism &c. were published by *Sirmond*, Paris 1643. 8vo. under the dubious title of *Eusebii Caesariensis Opuscula* xiv.

19. *Eclogarum propheticarum de Christo*, Libri iv, (a collection and explanation of the O. T. prophecies concerning *Christ*;) is said to exist in M. S. in the *Bibliotheca Viennensis*.

20. *Epistola ad Caesarienses*; a letter to his own church, concerning the Nicene creed; extant, Gr. and Lat. in *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 8. *Theod.* Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 12. et inter *Opera Anathasii*, tom. i. p. 238 ed. Paris.

Eusebius wrote many other works which have not reached us: namely, de Praeparatione Ecclesiastica Libri aliquot; de Demonstratione Ecclesiast.—contra Porphyrium Libri xxv; de Evangeliorum dissonantia; *ἑπεὶ Θεοφανείας* Libri v; Comment. in i. Epist. ad Corinth.—*ἑπεὶ τοῦ πικρῶν ὀνομάτων* Liber primus, (the first part of No. 11;)—de vita *Pamphili* Libri iii; Confutationis et Apologiae Libri ii, (probably, a defence of himself against the charge of Arianism;)—Antiquorum Martyriorum Collectio, (said to be in eleven Books;) Acta martyrii *Sti Luciani*; Descriptio Basilicae Hierosolym.—de Festo Paschale Liber; Epistola ad Constantiam de imagine Christi; Epistola ad Alexandrum Ep. Alex. de Ario; Epistola ad Euphrationem, (extracts from these 3 Epistles are found in the Acta Concilii Niceni ii. Actione 6^{ta}.) Tr.]

(13) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. ix. c. 6.—[*Peter* succeeded *Thomas* in the chair of Alexandria, in the year 300; was imprisoned in the year 303, and whether released or not, before his martyrdom in 311, is uncertain. He is represented as a very learned, pious, and active bishop. Of his writings, nothing remains but some rules respecting penance, and other points of ecclesiastical discipline, to be found in the collections of the ancient canons and decrees of councils. Tr.]

(14) The accounts given of *Athanasius* by the oriental writers, are collected

bishop of Cesarea [in Cappadocia,] who was inferior to few of this century, in felicity of genius, skill in debate, and elo-

by *Euseb. Renaudot*, in his *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinorum*, p. 83. All the works of *Athanasius* were splendidly published in three volumes Folio, by the Benedictine monk, *Bernh. de Montfaucon*.—[*Athanasius* was born at Alexandria about the year 298. He had a good education, and early displayed great strength of mind, and uncommon sagacity as a disputant, and a man of business. He was ordained a deacon in 319; and became the confidant and chief counsellor of his bishop *Alexander*, whom he accompanied to the council of Nice in 325. In that council he was very active, and acquired great reputation. In the year 326, *Alexander* died; and at his recommendation, *Athanasius* succeeded to the see of Alexandria, when only 27 or 28 years old. For half a century, he was the head of the orthodox party, in the Arian controversy. This rendered him extremely odious to the Arians, and involved him in controversy and sufferings nearly all his life. False accusations were raised against him; and a council was held at Cesarea AD. 334, before which he was summoned, but would not appear. The next year, by peremptory command of the emperor *Constantine*, he appeared before the council of Tyre, and answered to the charges of murder, unchastity, necromancy, encouraging sedition, oppressive exactions of money, and misuse of church property. Though his defence was good, he could not obtain justice; and he therefore fled to Constantinople, imploring the protection of the emperor. Here a council was assembled in 336, and a new charge falsely preferred against him, namely, that he prevented the shipments of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople. He was unjustly condemned, and banished to Treves in Belgium. *Arius* died that year, and *Constantine* the Great the year following. In the year 338, the sons of *Constantine* allowed *Athanasius* to return to Alexandria. He immediately began to displace Arians, and to recall the churches to the faith. Disturbances ensued; *Athanasius* was again accused; and made application to the bp. of Rome for aid. In 341, the council of Antioch decreed that no bishop who had been deposed by a council, ought ever to return to his see; and on this ground, the see of Alexandria was declared vacant, and one *Gregory* of Cappadocia appointed to it. *Gregory* took forcible possession of it, and *Athanasius* fled to Rome for protection. A provincial council held there, acquitted him on all the charges of his adversaries; and three years after, AD. 344, a much larger council held at Sardica, did the same. In 347, after an exile of 7 or 8 years, *Athanasius* was permitted by the Arian emperor *Constantius*, to return to his see. But in 350, on the death of *Constans*, he was again accused and persecuted. *Constantius* caused him to be condemned in a council at Arles in 354, and at the council of Milan in 355. *Athanasius* concealed himself at Alexandria two years, and then retired among the hermits of Egypt, till the death of *Constantius* in 361. In this retirement, he wrote most of his best works. On the accession of *Julian*, in 361, he returned to his flock. But two years after, the pagans joining the Arians, induced *Julian* to banish him again. But *Julian* died the same year, and *Athanasius* returned immediately to his see. In the year 367, the Arian emperor *Vulens* made some attempts to remove him, but without success. He died AD. 373, aged about 75, having been a bishop 46 years. He was truly a great man, a good bishop, and a most able, persevering, and successful defender of the orthodox faith, in respect to the Trinity. His works are chiefly controversial, and in relation to that one doctrine. They consist of numerous letters and tracts, together with some brief expositions of the scriptures, and a Life of *St. Anthony*. His four Orations, or Discourses, against the Arians, and his Discourse against the pagans, which are his largest works, were translated into English by *Sam. Parker*, and printed at Oxford, 1713. 2 vol. 8vo. His works, Gr. and Lat. two volumes in 3 parts, were best published by *Montfaucon*, Paris 1698; and Padua 1777. Fol. But a great number of letters, tracts, comments, and narratives, the production of subsequent ages, are falsely ascribed to him, and printed with his works. Among these, beyond all question, is the creed, *quicumque vult*, falsely called the *Athanasian Creed*. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.* i. p. 189. *Oudin.* de Scriptor. Eccles. tom. i. p. 312. *Fabricius*, *Biblioth.* Gr. vol. v. p. 297. *Montfaucon*, *Praef. ad Opp. Athanasii*; and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchegesch.* vol. xii. p. 93—252. Tr.]

quence.(15) *Cyrillus*, bishop of Jerusalem, has left us some catechetical discourses, which he delivered at Jerusalem; but many suspect him of intimacy with the semi-Arians.(16) *John*,

(15) His works are published by the Benedictine monk, *Julian Garnier*, Paris, [1721—1730.] 3 vol. fol. [*Basil* was born at *Cesarea* in *Cappadocia*, about AD. 329, and died archbishop of that church, AD. 379, aet. 50. His first instruction in religion was from his grandmother *Macrina*, a hearer and admirer of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*. His father whose name was *Basil*, instructed him in the liberal arts. Thence he went to Constantinople or to *Cesarea* in *Palestine*, and studied under *Libanius*, the philosopher and rhetorician. Next he studied at *Athens*, under *Himerius* and *Proaeresius*, having *Gregory Naz.* and *Julian* the apostate, for fellow students, in language, eloquence, poetry, history and philosophy. In the year 355, he returned to *Cappadocia*, taught rhetoric a short time, and then retired for 13 years to a monastery in *Pontus*. From this time, he became a most rigid ascetic, and a very zealous monk. He founded several monasteries, and composed rules and regulations for monks. In 363 he was called to *Cesarea*, and ordained a presbyter; the next year, falling out with his bishop *Eusebius*, he retired to his monastery, but was soon recalled by the bishop. He was now a very popular and efficient preacher. On the death of archbishop *Eusebius*, in the year 370, *Basil* was raised to the archiepiscopal chair. He still dressed and lived like a monk; but was a most active and efficient bishop. He reformed the morals of the clergy, established rigid discipline in the churches, promoted orthodoxy and harmony in that jarring age, established alms houses for the sick and indigent; and died triumphantly, on the 1st of January 379. Eulogies of him were composed by *Gregory Naz.* *Gregory Nyssen*, (who was his brother,) *Ephraem Syrus*, and *Amphylochius*. He was a fine belles lettres scholar, an elegant writer, and a good reasoner. His works that remain are numerous, consisting of near a hundred discourses, sermons, and homilies, 365 epistles, various ascetic tracts, controversial pieces, a liturgy &c. One of his best pieces is, his treatise on the person and offices of the Holy Spirit. He is unequal in his performances, and comes much short of *Chrysostom* as an orator. Yet his enthusiasm, his flexibility of style, and his clear and cogent reasoning, notwithstanding the gloomy austerity of his monastic character, entitle him to that high rank among the ancient clergy, which has ever been assigned him. See *Godf. Hermant*, *Vie de S. Basile le Grand*, *Archevêque de Cesarée en Cappadoce*, et celle de *S. Gregoire de Nazianze*, *Archev. de Constantinople*, Paris 1679. 2 vol. 4to. *Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. viii. p. 60 &c *Jul. Garnier*, *Vita Sti Basilii*, prefixed to the 3d vol. of his *Opp. Basilii*, Paris 1730: and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiii. p. 1—214. *Milner's Church History*, Cent. iv. ch. 23. For his character as a pulpit orator, see *Bernh. Eschenberg*, *Gesch. der Religionsvortrag*, p. 150—162, *Jena* 1785. 8vo. and *J. W. Schmidt*, *Anleitung zum populären Kanzelvortrag*, Pt. iii. p. 87—90. ed. 2. *Jena* 1800. 8vo. Tr.]

(16) The later editions of his works, are, in England, by *Tho. Milles*, [Oxford, 1703, Fol.] and in France, by the Benedictine *August. Toutte*, [Paris, 1720, Fol.]—*Cyril*, is supposed to have been born at Jerusalem, about the year 315. He was made deacon in the church of Jerusalem, about AD. 335, and presbyter, perhaps 3 years after. On the death of *Maximus* the bishop, *Cyril* was raised to the episcopal chair. But the Arian controversy, and his contest with *Acacius* of *Cesarea* respecting the priority of their episcopal sees, caused him to be twice deposed, (AD. 357 or 358, and 360,) and to be expelled from his see by the emperor *Valens* in 367. But he returned after short intervals to his charge; and from 378, sat peaceably in his chair, till his death, AD. 386.—He appears to have been truly orthodox, though not disposed to go to extremes. (*Theodorit*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. ii. c. 26. and L. v. c. 9.) Of his works, we have 23 Lectures to Catechumens; the first 18, on the creed of his church, (which was very nearly the same with what we call the Apostles' Creed,) and the other 5, to the newly baptized, on the ordinances, baptism, chrism (or confirmation), and the Lord's supper. These Lectures, though written when *Cyril* was a young man, and only a presbyter, about the year 348, or 349, are an invaluable treasure to us; as they are the most complete system of theology, and most circumstantial account of the rites of the church, which have reached us from so early an age. They are plain, didactic treatises, well adapted to the object for which they were written. See

for his eloquence surnamed *Chrysostom*, a man of genius, who presided over the church of Antioch and that of Constantinople, and has left us various specimens of his erudition, among which his public discourses, that were received with vast applause, stand conspicuous.(17) *Epiphanius*, bishop of Salamina in Cy-

Tzschirner, de Claris Vet. Eccl. Oratoribus, Commentatio vii Lips. 1821. 4to. Besides these lectures, a letter of his to the emperor *Constantius*, giving account of a marvellous appearance of a luminous cross in the heavens, AD. 351; and a discourse he delivered at Tyre; are preserved. See *Cave*, Histor. Litterar.—*Touttes*, preface to *Cyril's Works*; and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xii. p. 343—444. Tr.]

(17) For the best edition of the entire works of this most elegant and gifted man, in 11 [13] large Folio volumes, we are indebted to the industry of *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, [Paris, 1718—38.—*John Chrysostom* was the son of a respectable military gentleman of Antioch in Syria, named *Secundus*. He was born in the year 354, and lost his father in his childhood. Early discovering marks of uncommon genius, his mother *Anthusa*, a pious and excellent woman, procured for him the best instructors in all branches of learning. After spending three years in the family, and under the religious instruction of *Meletius* the bishop of Antioch, he attended the schools of *Libanius*, in rhetoric, of *Andragathias*, in philosophy, and of *Carterius* and *Diadorus*, (afterwards bishop of Tyre,) in sacred literature, who taught him to construe the scriptures literally. Distinguished as a scholar, he was also early pious; and about the age of twenty, embracing a monastic life, he retired to the mountains and spent four years in the society of an aged hermit, and two years more in a solitary cave. Nearly worn out by his austerities, he was obliged to return to Antioch, where he was made a deacon in 381, and commenced author at the age of 26. Five years after, he was ordained a presbyter, and began to preach. During twelve years he wrote and delivered an immense number of sermons, orations, and homilies. In the year 398, he was made patriarch of Constantinople, and in that station labored and preached incessantly. But his life was too austere, and his preaching too pungent, and his discipline too strict, for that corrupt metropolis. The empress, the lax clergy, and many courtiers combined against him. In the year 403, he was summoned before an irregular council, to answer to 46 frivolous or false charges; and refusing to appear, he was condemned, deposed, and banished, for contumacy. But his people were so tumultuous, that his enemies were compelled to recall him. The next year, however, AD. 404, he was forceably removed to Cucusus in Armenia, to the unspeakable grief of all good men. Here he suffered extremely, his health failed, and being removed to Pityus in Colchis, he died on the road thither, the 14th of September 407, aged 52 years and 8 months. For overpowering popular eloquence, *Chrysostom* had no equal among the fathers. His discourses show an inexhaustible richness of thought and illustration, of vivid conception, and striking imagery. His style is elevated, yet natural and clear. He transfuses his own glowing thoughts and emotions into all his hearers, seemingly without effort, and without the power of resistance. Yet he is sometimes too florid, he uses some false ornaments, he accumulates metaphors and illustrations, and carries both his views and his figures too far. The spirit of the man, and some idea of his style, may be learned from the following literal translation of a paragraph in one of his private letters to a friend, written during his exile.—“When driven from the city, I cared nothing for it. But I said to myself, if the empress wishes to banish me, let her banish me:—the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. If she would saw me in sunder, let her saw me in sunder:—I have *Isaiah* for a pattern. If she should plunge me in the sea:—I remember *Jonah*. If she would thrust me into the fiery furnace:—I see the three children enduring that. If she would cast me to wild beasts:—I call to mind *Daniel* in the den of lions. If she would stone me, let her stone me:—I have before me, *Stephen* the protomartyr. If she would take my head from me, let her take it:—I have *John* the Baptist. If she would deprive me of my worldly goods, let her do it:—naked came I from my mother's womb, and naked shall I return. An apostle has told me, “God respecteth not man's person:” and, “if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of *Christ*.” And *David* clothes me with armor

prus, has described the various sects of christians, as far down as his own times, in a large volume ; which, however, contains many defects and misrepresentations, arising from the credulity and ignorance of the author. (18) *Gregory* of Nazianzus, and *Gregory* of Nyssa, obtained much renown among the theologians and disputants of this age ; and their works show, that they were not unworthy to be held in estimation. (19) But after ages would have

saying, "I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and will not be ashamed." —The works of *Chrysostom*, (including some falsely ascribed to him,) consist of about 350 sermons and orations, on a great variety of subjects and occasions ; about 620 homilies, or exegetical discourses, on different books of the Old and New Testaments ; and about 250 Letters ; together with several tracts on monasticism, and a treatise *on the Priesthood*, in 6 Books. There is also a *Liturgy* which bears his name, being that used at Constantinople, and which perhaps received some alterations from his hand.—For an account of his life and writings, see *Cave*, *Histor. Litteraria* : *Tillemont*, *Memoires*—a l' *Hist. Eccles.* tome xi. p. 1—405, 547—626. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 245—490. *Montfaucon*, *Opp. Chrysost.* tom. xiii. p. 1—177.—For the sentiments, character and influence of the man, see *A. Neander's* *Johannes Chrysostomus und die Kirche in dessen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1821—22, 2 vol. 8vo. Tr.]

(18) His works, with a Latin translation and notes, were published by the Jesuit, *Dionys. Petavius*, [Paris 1622, 2 vol. Fol. and Cologne (Lips.) 1682.] His life is given in a good sized volume, by *Ja. Gervasius*, Paris, 1738. 4to. [*Epiphanius*, of Jewish extract, was born at *Bezanduca*, a village near Eleutheropolis, about twenty miles from Jerusalem, about the year 310. He became a monk in early life, visited Egypt, fell into the toils of the Gnostics, escaped, was intimate with *St. Antony* ; and returning to Palestine in his 20th year, about 330, became a disciple of *Hilarion*, established a monastery near his native village, called *Ancient Ad*, where he lived more than thirty years. He read much, and was ordained a presbyter over his monastery. In the year 367, he was made archbishop of *Constantia* (formerly *Salamis*) in Cyprus, but still lived by monastic rules.—He engaged in all the controversies of the times, was an active and popular bishop, for 36 years, and regarded as a great saint, and worker of miracles. In 376, he was at Antioch, on the Apollinarian heresy ; and 382, at Rome, on the Meletian controversy. He had a long and fierce contest with *John* bishop of Jerusalem, respecting *Origenism*, which he regarded with strong abhorrence. His friend *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, having expelled some monks from Egypt, on the charge of *Origenism*, in the year 401, *Epiphanius* held a provincial council of Cyprus, against that error ; and as the expelled monks fled to Constantinople, *Epiphanius* followed them in 402, intending to coerce *Chrysostom* into a condemnation of those monks and of *Origenism*. But his enterprise wholly failed, and he died on his way home, AD. 403, aged above 90 years. He became an author when turned of 60. His first work, *Anchoratus*, (*The Anchor*), was written AD. 374 ; to teach the world genuine christianity, in opposition to the prevailing and especially the Arian heresies. Soon after he composed his great work *contra octoginta Haereses*, in 3 Books, divided into 7 parts or *tomi*. He also made an Epitome of this work ; and wrote a treatise on (scripture) *Weights and Measures* ; a Letter to *John* bishop of Jerusalem ; another to *Jerome* ; and some other works of little value. It is said, he understood five languages, Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and Latin. His learning was great, his judgment rash, and his credulity and mistakes very abundant.—See *Cave*, *Histor. Litterar.* p. 231—234 ; and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 1—100. Tr.]

(19) Tolerable editions of the writings of both these men, were published in France, during the 17th century ; but better editions are anticipated, from the Benedictines. [After long delay, the first vol. of the expected Benedictine edition of *Gregory Nazianzen's* works appeared at Paris 1778, by *Clemencet*, large Fol. Of the old editions, the best is that of *Billius*, Gr. and Lat. Paris 1609 1630, and Cologne (Lips.) 1690, 2 vol. Fol. His works, as here published, consist of about 50 Orations, or Sermons ; near 250 Epistles ; and about 140 poems. Besides these, *Muratori* has published 228 Epigrams and short poems of his ; in

prized them higher, if they had been less attached to Origenism, and more free from the false eloquence of the sophists. Among the Syrians, *Ephraem* has given immortality to his name by the sanctity of his life, and by a great number of writings, in which he confutes heretics, explains the scriptures, and treats on reli-

his *Anecdota Gr.* p. 1—117, Petav. 1709. 4to. Some of the orations are violent attacks upon Arians and others; many others are eulogies on his friends and on monks; and a few are discourses on practical subjects. Of the poems, one of the longest is an account of his own life. Most of them were written after he retired from public life, and are of a religious character, but of no great merit as specimens of genius. As an orator *Gregory Naz.* is considered superior to *Basil*, for strength and grandeur. He also possessed a fertile imagination. But he has little method, and he abounds in false ornament.—He was born about the year 325. His father, who was also named *Gregory*, was bishop of Nazianzus in Cappadocia, for about 45 years, from AD. 329, to 374. His mother *Nonna*, like the mother of Samuel, devoted her son to the Lord before he was born. His education was begun at Cesarea in Cappadocia, continued at Cesarea in Palestine and at Alexandria, and completed at Athens, at the age of 30, AD. 355. He was at Athens about five years; and there commenced that intimacy with *Basil the Great*, which lasted through life. On his return to Nazianzus, in 356, he was baptized, and betook himself to a retired and studious life, for which he always manifested a strong predilection. In 361, his father compelled him to receive ordination as a presbyter; and the next year he preached his first sermon. On the death of *Julian*, who had been his fellow student at Athens, he composed two invectives against him. His friend archbishop *Basil*, in the year 372, offered him the bishopric of Sasima, which he refused with indignation, on account of his aversion to public life. Yet he afterwards consented to be ordained as assistant to his aged father, on condition of not being obliged to succeed him. Soon after the death of his father, in 374, he retired to Seleucia, and spent three years in obscurity. In 379, being pressed beyond the power of resistance, he went to Constantinople to preach to the remnant of the orthodox there. His success in converting Arians was here very great: and he was so popular, that the general council of Constantinople, and the emperor *Theodosius*, constrained him to accept the patriarchal chair of that metropolis. But before the council rose, it being objected to him, that it was irregular for a bishop to be transferred from one see to another, he gladly resigned. Returning to Nazianzus, he discharged the episcopal functions there for a short time. But in 383, he retired altogether from public life, and after about seven years, spent chiefly in writing religious poetry, he closed life, about AD. 390. See *Cave*, *Histor. Litteraria*; and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiii. p. 268—458.—*Gregory*, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, and younger brother of *Basil the Great*, was probably born about 331, at Cesarea in Cappadocia. Of his early education little is known. He was no monk, and at first averse from the ministry. He was made bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, about the year 372. But soon after he was driven from his see, by the persecution of the Arians, and for several years, travelled from place to place. In 378 he returned to his see. Afterwards, he was much employed on councils, and was greatly esteemed by the orthodox. The council of Antioch 379, appointed him to visit the churches in Arabia, and restore order there. On his way he visited Jerusalem; and was disgusted with the profligate morals there. In the year 381, he wrote his great work, against *Eunomius* the Arian, in xiii. Books, which procured him great reputation. At the general council of Antioch, in the same year, he is reported to have made the new draft of the Nicene creed, which was afterwards universally adopted by the orthodox. He was also at the council of Constantinople in 394, and probably died not long after. He was a man of considerable acumen, a zealous polemic, and an extravagant orator. His works consist of polemic discourses and treatises, orations, eulogies, letters and homilies; and were published Gr. and Lat. by *Fronto le Duc*, Paris, 1615. 2 vol. Fol. to which *Gretser* added a third vol. Paris 1618. The 3 vol. were reprinted, but less correctly, Paris 1638, Fol. A better edition has long been desired. See *Cave*, *Histor. Litter.* and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiv. p. 3—147. Tr.]

gious duties.(20) Among those of whom but few works have reached us, are, *Pamphylus*, the martyr and intimate friend of Eusebius ;(21) *Diodorus* of Tarsus ;(22) *Hosius*, of Corduba ;(23) *Eustathius* of Antioch ;(24) *Didymus* of Alexan-

(20) A full account is given of him, by *Jos. Simon Asseman*, in his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. i. p. 24 &c. The English published several of his works, in Greek, at Oxford [by *Edw. Thwaites*, 1709, Fol.] The same were published in a Latin translation by *Gerh. Vossius*, [Rome 1589—97, 3 vol. Fol.] His works were published in Syriac, a few years since, at Rome, by *Steph. Euod. Asseman*. [Six volumes in all ; vol. i, ii, iii, Gr. and Lat. 1732—43—46 ; vol. iv, v, vi, Syriac and Lat. 1737—40—43. Fol.—*Ephraem* Syrus, a monk and deacon of the church at Nisibis in northern Syria, was born and spent his whole life in and near that city. When elected bishop there, he feigned himself deranged and absconded, to avoid promotion. He was a most ardent devotee of monkery, a man of genius, and a prolific writer. His works consist of essays and sermons, chiefly on the monastic and moral virtues, commentaries on nearly the whole bible, and hymns and prayers. A few of his essays are polemic. All his works were written in Syriac ; and were so popular in Syria as to be read in public after the scriptures ; and being early translated into Greek, were held in high estimation in that age. It is said, his hymns and prayers are still used in the Syriac churches. He died AD. 378. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 115. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. iii. c. 16. *Theodorit*, Hist. Eccles. ii. c. 30. and iv. 29. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. viii. 255 &c. and xv. 527 &c. *Milner's Church History*, Cent. iv. ch. 21. Tr.]

(21) [*Pamphylus*, a presbyter of Cesarea in Palestine, was born at Berytus, studied under *Pierius* of Alexandria, and spent his life at Cesarea. He was a learned, benevolent, and devout man, and a great promoter of theological learning. He procured an immense theological library, which he gave to the church of Cesarea. Most of the works of *Origen*, he transcribed with his own hand, and particularly the corrected copy of the Septuagint in *Origen's Hexapla*. One of these transcripts, *P. D. Huet* states, is still in possession of the Jesuits of Clermont. He wrote a vindication and biography of *Origen*, in 5 Books, to which *Eusebius* added a sixth Book. The whole are lost, except a Latin translation of Book first, made by *Ruffinus*. During the persecution he was imprisoned two years, and then put to death. *Eusebius*, his great admirer, wrote his life, in iii. Books, which are lost. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 77. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vi. c. 32. *Cave*, Historia Litterar. Tr.]

(22) [*Diodorus*, or *Theodorus*, bishop of Tarsus, was head of a monastic school and presbyter at Antioch, where he had *Chrysostom* for a pupil. He became bishop of Tarsus in 378, sat in the general council at Constantinople 381, and was succeeded at Tyre by *Phalerius* AD. 394. He was a learned man, and a voluminous, though not an elegant, writer. His works were chiefly scientific and controversial, in opposition to errorists and unbelievers ; and explanatory of the scriptures, which he construed literally. None of his works remain entire ; but abstracts and numerous extracts are preserved by *Photius* and others. See *Suidas*, voce Διόδωρος. *Socrates*, H. E. vi. 3. *Sozomen*, H. E. viii. 2. *Theodorit*, H. E. iv. 25. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 119. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 358 &c. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—a l' Hist. Eccles. tome viii. p. 558 &c. 802 &c. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. x. p. 247—251. Tr.]

(23) [*Hosius*, bishop of Corduba in Spain, was born about the middle of the preceding century, became a bishop before the end of it, and sat in the council of Illiberis, AD. 305. He was chief counsellor, in ecclesiastical affairs, to *Constantine* the Great ; who summoned him to the council of Arles, in 314, and sent him to Egypt, to settle the religious disputes of that country, in 324. He stood at the head of the council of Nice, in 325 ; and presided in that of Sardica, in 347. By the Arian Council of Sirmium 356, he was banished, when near a hundred years old ; and unable to resist, he now signed an artfully drawn Arian creed ; and died AD. 361, having lived more than a 100 years, and been a bishop during about 70. Nothing written by him remains, except an epistle to the emperor *Constantius*, preserved by *Athanasius*, in his *Historia Arianor. ad Monachos*. See *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—a l' Hist. Eccles. tome vii. p. 300—321. and *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 399. Tr.]

(24) [*Eustathius*, a native of Side in Pamphylia, was bishop of Beaea (now

dria;(25) *Amphilochius* of Iconium;(26) *Palladius*, author of the *Lausiaca History*;(27) *Macarius*, senior and junior;(28)

Aleppo) in Syria, and promoted to the patriarchate of Antioch by the council of Nice, AD. 325. He had previously distinguished himself, as an opposer of Arianism; and in that council, he acted a conspicuous part. This, together with his *Libri viii. contra Arianos*, rendered him extremely obnoxious to the abettors of Arianism, who procured his condemnation in one of their councils, about the year 330. *Eustathius* appealed in vain to the emperor, *Constantine* the Great; he was banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace, where he died about the year 360. The only entire works of his now extant, are his treatise on the witch of Endor, in opposition to *Origen*; and a short address to the emperor, delivered at the council of Nice. These, together with a treatise on the Hexaëmeron, which is ascribed to him, were published by *Leo Allatius*, Lyons, 1629, 4to. What remains of his viii Books against the Arians, was published by *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 170 &c. He was highly esteemed by the orthodox of his times. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 85. *Chrysostom*, Laudatio Eustathii, Opp. Chrysost. tom. ii. p. 603. *Athanasius*, Epist. ad Solitarios; *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. Du Pin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. vol. iii. *Fabricius*, ubi supra, p. 166 &c. and *Schroëckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. v. p. 275 &c. Tr.]

(25) [*Didymus*, a learned monk of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, was the preceptor of *Jerome* and *Rufinus*. He lost his eye-sight, when young; yet became very conspicuous as a scholar and a theologian. He was born about the year 311, and was alive AD. 392, then more than 83 years old. Of his numerous works, only three have reached us; namely, de Spiritu Sancto Liber, preserved in a Latin translation of *Jerome*, (inter Opp. Hieronymi tom. iv. Pt. i. p. 493 &c.) Scholia on the canonical Epistles, also in a Latin translation. Both these are given in the Biblioth. Patr. tom. v. p. 320, 338. Liber adversus Manichæos; Gr. and Lat. in *Combesis*, Auctarium noviss. Biblioth. Patr. Pt. ii. p. 21 &c. Besides these, he wrote commentaries on the greater part of the bible; and, de Trinitate Lib. iii; contra Arianos Libri ii; and a comment on the four Books of *Origen*, de Principiis; in defence of *Origen's* sentiments. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr. c. 109; and *Cave*, Historia Litteraria. Tr.]

(26) [*Amphilochius*, after being a civil magistrate, and living a while with *Basil* and *Gregory Naz.* in their monastery, was made bishop of *Iconium* in *Lycania*, about the year 370 or 375. He sat in the second gen. council, at Constantinople, AD. 381; and in the same year, was appointed by the emperor *Theodosius*, inspector of the clergy in the diocese of Asia. Two years after, wishing to persuade the emperor to enact severer laws against the Arians, he appeared in his presence, without showing respect to his son, the young *Arcadius*. At this the emperor was indignant. The bishop replied: "Sire, are you offended because indignity is offered to your son? Then, be assured, God must abhor those who treat his Son with disrespect." The argument was irresistible; and the emperor granted his request. He probably died AD. 395. Ten short pieces, chiefly orations, and various fragments, were published as his works, though most of them are of dubious origin, by *Combesis*, Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1644. Fol. including the works of *Methodius* Patarens. and *Andreas* Cretensis. A few other tracts are extant under his name; and a considerable number mentioned by the ancients, cannot now be found. See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. vii. p. 500—507; *Oudin*, Commentar. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. tom. ii. p. 216 &c. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. and *Schroëckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xii. p. 67—70. Tr.]

(27) [*Palladius* of Galatia, born AD. 368; at the age of 20 went to Egypt, to get a practical knowledge of monkery. After residing among the monks of Egypt several years, his health failed, and he returned to Palestine, still leading a monastic life. In the year 400, going to Bithynia, *Chrysostom* ordained him bp. of Hellenopolis, which he afterwards exchanged for Aspona in Galatia. After the fall of *Chrysostom* in 404, *Palladius* was banished, and died in exile about AD. 431. His great work was composed about the year 420, and contains the history of the principal monks of his own times, with many of whom he was personally acquainted. Being written at the request of *Lausus*, the emperor's lord of the bed chamber, it was called *Historia Lausiaca*. It is the honest statement of a credulous monk, who almost adored the heroes of his story. Several

Apollinaris, senior;(29) and a few others,(30) are most fre-

Latin editions have been published. In Greek it appeared, Lugd. Bat. 1616, 4to: and Gr. and Lat. in the Auctar. Biblioth. Patr. Paris 1624. tom. ii. p. 893—1053. Fol. and in Biblioth. Partr. Paris 1624, tom. xiii.—The other works ascribed to him are, *Dialogi de Vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi*, inter *Palladium Ep. Hellenopolitanum et Theodorum ecclesiae Romanae diaconum*, (extat inter *Opp. Chrysost.*) and *de gentibus Indiae et Brachmanibus Liber*.—See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. ix. p. 2 &c. *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des Auteurs &c. *Cave*, Historia Litterar. *Tillemont*, Memoires—a l'Hist. Eccles. vol. xi. p. 500 &c. Tr.]

(28) [*Macarius* senior, or the Great, called the *Egyptian Macarius*, a native of Thebais, was born AD. 302, early addicted himself to a monastic life, at the age of 30 retired to the wilderness of *Scetis* and the mountain *Nitria*, where he lived a hermit for 60 years. He became a presbyter at the age of 40, and died at the age of 90, AD. 391. Much is related of his austerities, his virtues, his wisdom, and his miracles. To him are ascribed, and it is probable, correctly, seven opuscula and 50 homilies or discourses; all upon practical and experimental religion: edited, last, by *J. G. Pritius*, Gr. and Lat. Lips. 1714, 2 vol. in one, 12mo. pp. 285 and 566.—*Macarius* junior, called the *Alexandrian Macarius*, because he was born and spent the first part of his life at Alexandria, was contemporary with *Macarius* senior, with whom he is often confounded. He was born about AD. 304, pursued traffic some years, became a monk, retired to the wilderness of *Scetis*, was baptized at 40, became a presbyter, headed a numerous band of monks in the mountains of *Nitria*, and died about AD. 404, aged 100 years. He was no less distinguished for his virtues and his miracles, than the other *Macarius*. Both copied after *St. Antonius*, both were hermits, inhabited the same region of country, and lived at the same time. But the senior *Macarius* was unsocial, especially with strangers; whereas the younger was very affable, and often visited the city Alexandria; whence he was called *πολιτικός*, the citizen. The younger wrote nothing, but a single letter to his disciples. The code of 30 monastic rules, ascribed to him, was probably the production of a later age. Both are mentioned by most of the contemporary writers, as *Jerome*, *Ruffinus*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and especially *Palladius* (*Lausiaca* History, c. 19, 20,) who was disciple of the younger *Macarius*. But this history is little more than an account of their rules of life, their conversations, their miraculous deeds, the admiration in which they were held, and the crowds of visitors and disciples which attended them. See *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 23. *Palladius*, Hist. Lausiaca, c. 19, 20. *Rufinus*, Vitae Patrum, c. 28. *Cassianus* de Coenobior. Institut. L. v. c. 41. and Collat. v. c. 12. xv. c. 3. xxiv. c. 13. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. iii. c. 14. L. vi. c. 29. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 21. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—a l'Hist. Eccles. tom. viii. p. 243. 264, 357. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. vii. p. 491 &c. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. Tr.]

(29) *Apollinaris*, or *Apollinarius*, senior, was born at Alexandria, taught grammar at *Berytus*, and at *Laodicea* in Syria, where he became a presbyter. He associated with *Epiphanius* the sophist, a pagan, and attended his lectures; for which, both he and his son, the younger *Apollinaris*, were excommunicated. But repenting, they were restored. In the year 362, when the emperor *Julian* prohibited the christians from reading the classic poets and orators, *Apollinaris* and his son undertook to compose some sacred classics, to supply the place of the pagan. The father took up the O. Testament, and transferred the Pentateuch into heroic verse, in imitation of *Homer*; and also, according to *Sozomen*, the rest of the O. T. history he formed into Comedies, Tragedies, Lyrics &c. in imitation of *Menander*, *Euripides*, and *Pindar*. The son labored on the New Test. and transferred the Gospels and the canonical Epistles into Dialogues, in imitation of those of *Plato*. Nearly all, if not the whole, of these sacred classics, are lost. Yet there is extant a poetic Gr. version of the Psalms, bearing the name of *Apollinaris*. The Tragedy of *Christ suffering*, published among the works of *Gregory Naz.* is also by some ascribed to the elder *Apollinaris*.—The younger *Apollinaris*, wrote likewise, *adversus Porphyrium Libri 30*; *de Veritate*, *adv. Julianum et philosophos*; *contra Eunomii apologium Liber*; *Commentarii breves in Isaiam*; *Hymni et Cantica sacra*; *de Incarnatione Libellus*; *de Fide Libellus*; and several Epistles, of which two perhaps are extant. Of all the rest of his works, only fragments remain.—The younger *Apollinaris* believed, that the

quently mentioned, on account of their learning, and their achievements.

divine nature in *Christ* did the office of a *rational* human soul; so that God the Word, a *sensitive* soul (ψυχή.) and a body, constituted the person of the Savior. For this, he was accounted a heretic, and condemned by public councils. He died between AD. 380 and 392.—Both were learned and excellent men, and strenuous opposers of the Arian creed. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 104. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. ii. 46, and iii. 16. *Sozomen*, H. E. v. 18. and vi. 25. *Philostorg*, H. E. viii. 11—15. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. vii. p. 659 &c. viii. p. 332. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—a l'Hist. Eccles. vol. vii. *Cave*, Histor. Litteraria. Tr.]

(30) [Less distinguished, than the foregoing, were, in the eastern or Greek church, The pseudo-*Dorotheus*, a fabled bishop of Tyre, who was a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, and a martyr under *Julian*, aged more than 100 years. To him is attributed the Epitome of the lives of the Prophets, Apostles, and the 70 Disciples of Christ; extant in the Biblioth. Patr. tom. iii. p. 421. See *Cave*, Historia Litterar.

Alexander, bishop of *Alexandria*, AD. 312—325, famous, as beginning the controversy with *Arius*, who was his presbyter. Of more than 70 epistles, written by him on the Arian controversy, only two are extant: preserved, one by *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 4. and the other by *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 6.

Constantine the Great, emperor AD. 306—337. He wrote many epistles and some orations, which his secretaries translated into Greek. Of these, 24 Epistles and two orations are preserved, by *Eusebius* and others, and among the Acts of councils. Many of his edicts are also preserved in the Codex Theodosianus.

Eusebius, bishop of *Nicomedia*, and afterwards court bishop of *Constantinople*, and the staunch patron of *Arius*. He was condemned in the council of Nice, and banished; retracted and was restored; became the great supporter of Arianism; and died AD. 342. A single epistle of his, has been preserved by *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 6.

James, bishop of *Nisibis* in Syria; a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, an assessor in the Nicene council, and died in the reign of *Constantius*. He probably wrote wholly in Syriac; but his works were first published, Armenian and Latin, by *N. Antonelli*, Rome 1756, Fol. containing 19 essays and discourses, chiefly on moral and practical subjects.

St. Antonius, a renowned Egyptian monk, who flourished about AD. 330. His life, written by *Athanasius*, is still extant; likewise, his monastic rules, his remarks on cases of conscience, and about 20 Discourses. These opuscula were published, in a Latin translation from Arabic, Rome 1646. 8vo.

Asterius of Cappadocia, a fickle and ambitious man, in the period next following the Nicene council, and a zealous Arian. He was never admitted to the clerical office, possessed some talent, and wrote comments on the scriptures, and tracts in favor of Arianism; of which, only fragments remain.

Marcellus, bishop of *Ancyra* in Galatia. He held a council at Ancyra in 315, and was conspicuous in the orthodox ranks at the council of Nice. Afterwards his zeal against Arianism, carried him into *Sabellianism*. He was condemned and deposed in 335, acquitted in 347, but still regarded with suspicion. He died AD. 370. Many wrote against him; and he wrote much, but nothing but what time has consumed.

Theodorus, bishop of *Heraclea* in Thrace AD. 334—344, a semi-Arian, and a zealous opposer of *Athanasius*. He died about the year 358. His commentaries on various parts of the bible, are highly commended by *Jerome* and others, for their style and erudition. All are lost, except his commentary on the Psalms, which is prefixed to the Catenae Veterum Patrum in Psalms, ed. Antwerp, 1643, 3 vol. Fol.

Acacius, bishop of *Cesarea* in Palestine AD. 340—366, successor to *Eusebius*, whose secretary he had been; a man of learning and eloquence, but unstable, and fluctuating between Arianism and orthodoxy. He wrote much, particularly in explanation of the scriptures; but nothing, that has been preserved.

Triphilus of *Ledris* in Cyprus, flourished AD. 340. He was bred to the bar, and was considered one of the most elegant writers of his age. He wrote on the Canticles, and the life of *Spiridon*, his bishop; but nothing of his, remains.

§ 10. Among the Latin writers, the following are most worthy of notice. *Hilary*, bishop of *Poitiers*, famous for his twelve *Books on the Trinity*, and for other writings. He possessed a

Eusebius, bishop of *Emessa* in Phenicia, was born at Edessa, studied there, and at Alexandria in Egypt, and Antioch in Syria. As early as 312, he was distinguished for scholarship and for unassuming modesty. He refused the bishopric of Alexandria in 341; but soon after accepted that of *Emessa*, and died about AD. 360. He leaned towards semi-Arianism; wrote much and elegantly, on the scriptures, and against the Jews. What has been published as his, has been much questioned.

George, bishop of *Laodicea*, a staunch Arian, and active in all their measures, from AD. 335, to 360. He wrote against the Manichaeans; the life of *Eusebius Emessenus*; and several epistles, one of which is preserved by *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 13.

Pachomius, (died 350,) *Theodorus*, his successor, and *Oresius*, were distinguished, contemporary monks of *Tabennesis* in Thebais, Egypt. They flourished from AD. 340—350. Monastic rules, some epistles, and several discourses, are extant under the names of one or more of them.

Serapion, a monk of Thebais, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the friend of *Athanasius*, who made him bishop of *Thmuis*. He died about AD. 358. Of his once popular writings, only his *Liber contra Manichaeos* is extant; Latin, in the Biblioth. Patr. tom. iv. p. 160.

Basil, bishop of *Ancyra*, from 336, to 360, was a semi-Arian, highly esteemed by *Constantius*, and very active against the orthodox. Contention between him and *Acacius*, preceded his deposition and banishment to Illyricum in the year 360. He wrote much, and in particular, against *Marcellus* his predecessor; but none of his works are extant.

Leontius, the Arian bishop of *Antioch*, AD. 348—358, a crafty and deceptive man; who was active in the contentions of his times. Of his writings, only a fragment of one discourse remains.

Marcus, an Egyptian bishop, and a friend of *Athanasius*, banished in 356 by *George* bishop of Alexandria. He wrote an oration against the Arians, which is published, with *Origen's* tract on the Lord's prayer, by *Wetstein*, Amsterd. 1695. 4to.

Actius of Syria, a goldsmith, physician, deacon at Antioch, bishop somewhere, and finally a heretic. He held *Christ* to be a mere creature. He died about the year 366. His book *de Fide*, in 47 chapters, is transcribed and refuted, in *Epiphanius*, Haeres. 76.

Eudoxius, bishop of *Germanicia* on the Euphrates, and (356) of *Antioch*, and (360) of *Constantinople*; died AD. 370. He was successively an Arian, a semi-Arian, and an *Actian*; a learned, but a verbose and obscure writer. Large fragments of his discourse, *de Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, are extant.

Eunomius, the secretary and disciple of *Actius*, but more famous than his master. He was made bishop of *Cyzicum* AD. 360, banished soon after, wandered much, and died about AD. 394. He wrote on the epistle to the Romans; many letters; his own creed, and an Apology for it. Only the two last are extant. He held *Christ* to be a created being, and of a nature unlike to that of God.

Meletius, bishop of *Sebaste* in Armenia, and (360) of *Antioch*. He was banished AD. 361, returned under *Julian*; was banished again under *Valens*, and restored by *Gratian*, and died while attending the general council of Constantinople AD. 381, at an advanced age. There is extant, (in *Epiphanius*, Haeres. 73. c. 29—34,) an able discourse, which he delivered at Antioch in 361, when, holding up three fingers, and then closing two of them, he said: "We conceive there are three persons, but we address them as one."

Titus, bishop of *Bostra* in Arabia, was driven from his see, under *Julian*, AD. 362; returned under *Valentinian*; and died about the year 371. He wrote *contra Manichaeos* libri iii, which are extant in a Latin translation, in Biblioth. Patr. tom. iv. A discourse likewise, on the branches of palm, Gr. and Lat. and a commentary on Luke, in Latin, have been published under his name, but are questioned.

Paphnutius, a celebrated Egyptian monk, who flourished AD. 370. He wrote the life of *St Onyphrius*, and of several other monks; still extant.

considerable degree of perspicuity and ingenuity ; but he was often disposed to borrow from *Tertullian* and *Origen*, whom he greatly admired, rather than to tax his own genius.(31) *Lactantius*

Caesarius, younger brother of *Gregory Nazianzenus*, was a learned physician of Constantinople, and was elevated to civil office. He is said to have written several works, and particularly a treatise against the pagans. There are extant under his name, iv Dialogues, Gr. and Lat. on 195 questions in theology ; in *Fronto le Duc's* Auctarium Biblioth. Patr. 1624. tom. i. But they are supposed not to be his, as they shew the hand of a well read theologian.

Evagrius, archdeacon of Constantinople, in 381, and after 385, an Egyptian monk. He was a pious and learned man, and a considerable writer. Several of his devotional and practical works are extant, in the different collections of the works of the fathers.

Nemesius, bishop of *Emessa*, after being a christian philosopher. He flourished AD. 380, and with *Origen*, held the preexistence of human souls ; as appears from his book, *de Natura Hominis*, extant in the Auctarium Biblioth. Patr. 1624. tom. ii. also printed Gr. and Lat. Oxford 1671. 8vo.

Nectarius, bishop of *Constantinople* AD. 381—398, orthodox and pious. One of his discourses is extant, inter Opp. *Chrysostomi*, who was his successor.

Flavianus, a monk, and bishop of *Antioch* AD. 381—403. He first divided the choir, and taught them to sing the Psalms of David responsively. He was strenuous against the Arians ; but fragments only of his discourses and letters, remain.

Theophilus, bishop of *Alexandria* AD. 385—412, was famous for his contention with the Nitric monks, and for his opposition to Origenism. Of his works only a few epistles, and considerable extracts from his other writings, are extant.

John, bishop of *Jerusalem* AD. 386—416, famous for his contests with *Epiphanius* and with *Jerome*, respecting *Origen's* character. Numerous works, perhaps without foundation, are published as his. They consist of commentaries on scripture and homilies. The homilies are printed among the works of *Chrysostom* : and the whole are published as his works, Brussels, 1643. 2 vol. Fol.

Hieronymus of *Dalmatia*, a presbyter, and monk, who flourished AD. 386. He is author of Lives of the Egyptian monks ; the original Greek, though preserved, has not been published ; because the *Lausiaca History* of *Palladius* is nearly a literal translation of it.

Sophronius, the friend of *Jerome*, and translator into Greek of some of his works, particularly of his book, *de Viris Illustribus*. He flourished about AD. 390 ; and was, as *Jerome* says, apprime eruditus ; yet he is little noticed by other cotemporary writers. Tr.]

(31) Concerning *Hilary*, the Benedictine monks have given an accurate account, in their *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tome ii. [tome i. Partie ii.] p. 139—193, [à Paris, 1733. 4to.] The best edition of his works, is that of the French Benedictines, [by *Coutant*, Paris 1693. Fol. revised and improved by *Scip. Maffei*, Verona, 1730. 2 vol. Fol.—*Hilary* of *Poitiers* in France, was a native of Gaul, of respectable parentage, and well educated. He was a pagan, till he had attained to manhood. His consecration to the episcopal office, was about the year 350. For 20 years he stood preeminent among the Gallic bishops, and did much to arrest the progress of Arianism in the West. In the council of *Bes-sieres*, AD. 356, he handled the Arian bishops, *Saturninus*, *Ursacius*, *Valens* and others, so roughly, that they applied to the emperor *Constantius*, and had him banished to Phrygia. During the four years he was an exile in Asia, he wrote most of his works, and was so active in opposing Arianism there, that the heretical clergy, to get rid of him, procured his release from banishment. He returned to his church, a more able and more successful antagonist to the Gallic Arians than he was before. He was the principal means of rolling back the Arian current, which was sweeping over the West.—His great work is his *de Trinitate* Libri xii. He also wrote three different tracts addressed to the emperor ; an account of the synods in the East against the Arians ; concerning the councils of *Arimini* and *Seleucia*, and the events that followed to the year 366 ; Commentaries on Matthew, and on the Psalms. Besides these, he wrote several works which are lost, such as commentaries, hymns, epistles, &c.—See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 100. *Fortunatus*, de Vita Hilarii Libri ii. (prefixed to

the most eloquent of the Latin christians in this century, assailed the superstition of the pagans, in his *Divine Institutions*; and likewise wrote on other subjects. But he is more successful in confuting the errors of others, than in correcting his own.(32) *Ambrose*, first a governor, and then bishop of *Milan*, is not rude in diction or conception, nor is he destitute of valuable thoughts; yet he is chargeable with the faults of the age, a deficiency in solidity, accuracy, and good arrangement.(33) *Hieronymus*, a

the Opp. *Hilarii* ed. Bened.) *Coutant*, Life of Hilary, prefixed to the Benedictine edition of his works; *Tillemont*, Memoires—a l'Hist. Eccles. tome vii. p. 442 &c. 745 &c. and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xii. p. 253—342.—*Hilary* was learned, but his style is exceedingly swollen and obscure. Tr.]

(32) Of *Lactantius* also, the Benedictines have given an account, in their *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 65 &c. His works have been through numerous editions; the latest and best are by the celebrated *Bunemann*, [Lips. 1739. 8vo.] the venerable *Heumann*, [Gotting, 1736. 8vo.] and *Lenglet du Fresnoy*, [Paris, 1748, 2 vol. 4to. and Zweybr. 1786. 2 vol. 8vo.—*Lucius Cæcilius Lactantius Firmilianus* was probably a native of Italy; studied under *Arnobius* in Africa; removed to Nicomedia in the reign of *Diocletian*, and opened a school for rhetoric, in which he had but few pupils. He was made private tutor or governor to *Crispus*, the oldest son of *Constantine* the Great, when an old man; and probably died a little before AD. 330. He was learned, though not a profound theologian, and the most elegant of all the Latin fathers. Some think him the best writer of Latin, after the days of *Cicero*.—His works still extant, are, *Divinarum Institutionum Libri vii.* written about the year 320. This is his great work. It may be called a Guide to true Religion; being designed to enlighten the pagans, and convert them to christianity. *Institutionum Epitome*; or an Abridgement of the preceding. It is imperfect, extending over the three last Books only. *De Ira Dei*; and *de Opificio Dei*, or on the works of creation, particularly on the physical structure and powers of man. These two works are, properly, a continuation of the first; being written in furtherance of the same designs. *De Mortibus Persecutorum*; an account of persecutors and persecutions, from *Nero*, to *Maxentius*, AD. 312. There is no good reason to doubt its genuineness. An English translation of this valuable treatise, with a long preface, was published by *Gilb. Burnet*, 1637, 18mo. *Symposium*; a juvenile performance, extant as the work of a fabled *Symposium*. The *Carmen de Phœnice*, is perhaps his. His lost works are, *Grammaticus*; ὁδοιπορικὸν, a poetic account of his voyage to Nicomedia; *ad Asclepiadem Libri ii*; *ab Probum Epistolarum Libri iv*; *ad Severum Epistolar. Libri ii*; *ad Demetrianum Epistolar. Libri ii*.—See *Jerome* de *Viris Illustr.* c. 80. *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.* *Lardner*, *Credibility* &c. vol. vii. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. v. p. 220—262. Tr.]

(33) The Benedictine monks of France, published his works in 2 large Folio volumes [1686—1690.—*Ambrose* was the son of a praetorian prefect of the same name, who was governor general of Gaul, Britain and Spain. After a good education for civil life, he became an advocate, counsellor to *Probus* his father's successor, and at last governor of Liguria and Aemelia, resident at Milan. In the year 374, *Auxentius*, bp. of Milan, died; and the Arians and orthodox became tumultuous in the church, when met to elect a successor. *Ambrose* entered the church to quell the riot, and a little child happening to say "*Ambrose, bishop*," the mob presently cried out, "let him be the bishop."—He was constrained to submit; gave up all his property, and his worldly honors, was baptized, and became a laborious and self denying bishop. An irruption of barbarians in 377, obliged him to flee; and he went to Illyricum, and thence to Rome. In the year 381, he presided in the council of Aquileia. In 383, the emperor *Valentinian* sent him as ambassador to *Maximus* the usurper in Gaul. Next came his contest with *Symmachus*, prefect of Rome, respecting the rebuilding the pagan altar of Victory in that city. In 386, he had much contention with the Arians of Milan. Afterwards he was sent on a second embassy to *Maximus*. Three years after, he debarred the emperor *Theodosius* the Great from christian ordinances, and re-

monk of Palestine, has undoubtedly merited the esteem of the christian world, by various of his productions; but at the same time, his bitterness towards those who differed from him, his eagerness after fame, his choleric and ungovernable temper, his unjust aspersions on good and innocent persons, and other defects of character, have disgraced him not a little, in the view of those who are neither uncandid nor incompetent judges. Among his various writings, those which interpret the holy scriptures, and his *epistles*, are the most valuable. (34) *Augustine*, bishop of

quired him to do penance, for the slaughter of the citizens of Thessalonica by his order. In 392, civil war obliged him to leave Milan for a time. He soon returned, but died AD. 397, aged 64 years. He was devout, energetic, orthodox, and a very useful bishop. His knowledge of theology was not great; but he was able to read the Greek fathers, and he knew the world. His writings were numerous. On the scriptures he wrote much, but nothing that is valuable. He wrote several treatises and discourses on monkery; *de Officiis Libri iii*; *de Mysteriis Liber*; *de Sacramentis Libri v*. which are greatly corrupted, if not altogether suppositious; *de Poenitentia Libri ii*. also *de Fide*, or *de Trinitate, Libri v*; and *de Spiritu Sancto Libri iii*; the two last were, in great measure, compilations from Greek fathers, and were addressed to the emperor *Gratian*. Several discourses and eulogies, and about 90 epistles, of his production, are extant; besides a great number of short sermons, scholia on the canonical Epistles, and tracts of different kinds, which are falsely ascribed to him.—His life, written by *Paulinus*, his private secretary, is stuffed with accounts of miracles, and wonders, performed by him. See Opp. Ambrosii, tom. ii. Appendix. ed. Benedict. Cave, *Historia Litterar. Tillemont, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles. tom. x. p. 78—306, 729 &c. G. Hermant, Vie de S. Ambroise, à Paris, 1678, 4to. Schroeckh, Kirchengesch. vol. xiv. p. 148—332. and Jos. Milner, Church History, Cent. iv. ch. 12—16, 18. Tr.]*

(34) The defects of *Jerome*, are learnedly exposed by *Jo. le Clerc*, in his *Quaestiones Hieronymianae*, Amstelod. 1700. 12mo. His works have been published by the Benedictines, [ed. *Martianay*, Paris, 1693—1706,] in five volumes Folio. This edition was republished, with considerable additions [and improvements in the arrangement, the prefaces, and the explanatory notes,] by *Vallarsius*, Verona, [1734—43, xi. Vol, Fol.—*Hieronymus Stridonensis*, or *Jerome of Stridon* in Dalmatia, was born of christian parents, about the year 331. His father, *Eusebius*, gave him the best advantages for education. He was early sent to Rome, where he studied many years, and under the best masters. About the year 363, he was baptized, and left Rome, to travel for improvement in knowledge. He journeyed through Gaul, and resided a few years at *Treves*, where he became a monk, and devoured many books. On his return he spent some time at *Aquileia*, where he formed a close friendship with *Ruffinus*. In 373 he left *Aquileia*, and embarked for Syria, in company with several friends, and carrying his own large collection of books. Landing in Thrace, he passed the Bosphorus, and travelled over land to *Antioch*. Here his friend *Innocentius* died, and he himself was dangerously sick. After recovering, he was induced by a dream to renounce forever the reading of the pagan classics. From *Apollinaris* the younger, he obtained farther instruction in biblical interpretation. In 374, he retired into the wilderness eastward of Antioch; and supported by his friends, he there spent about four years in the character of a learned hermit, and author, who nevertheless held correspondence with the world, and took part in the passing religious controversies. In 378 or 379, he returned to *Antioch*, and was ordained a presbyter. The next year he visited *Constantinople*, to enjoy the instructions of *Gregory Nazianzen*. Here he continued two or three years, formed a better acquaintance with the Greek fathers, and translated some of their works; in particular, *Eusebius'* Chronicon, which he continued down to AD. 378; and *Origen's* Homilies on Jeremiah. In 382, he accompanied *Paulinus* and *Epiphanius* to Rome, respecting the contests in the church of Antioch. *Damasus*, bishop of Rome, was much pleased with him, employed him occasionally

Hippo in Africa, is one whose fame is spread throughout the christian world. And he certainly possessed many and great excellencies, a superior genius, a constant love and pursuit of truth, admirable patience of labor, unquestionable piety, and acuteness and discrimination by no means contemptible. But his power of judging was not equally great; and often the natural ardor of his mind carried this excellent man farther, than his reason and distinct comprehension could go. He has therefore afforded much ground for controversy to many, respecting his real sentiments; and to others, occasion to tax him with inconsistency, and with hastily throwing upon paper thoughts, which he had not himself duly considered.(35) *Optatus of Milevi*, an African, has ob-

as a private secretary, and prompted him to write on several biblical subjects, and at length, to undertake a correction of the vulgar Latin Bible. *Jerome* likewise did much to promote monkery in Italy. But the ardor he kindled up, on this subject, among the Roman ladies, created him enemies among the other sex. He also gave offence to the clergy of Rome, and thought it best to leave Italy in 385, and return to the East, with *Paula* and *Eustochium* her daughter, wealthy Roman ladies, whom he had rendered enthusiastic in regard to monastic institutions. He first went to Antioch, and thence to *Jerusalem*, where he and his ladies performed a winter's pilgrimage. In the spring of 396, they went to Alexandria, and thence to visit the Nitric monks. Returning the same year to Palestine, they took up their permanent residence at *Bethlehem*. Here *Paula* erected four monasteries, three for nuns, and one for monks. In this last, *Jerome* passed the remainder of his days, in reading, composing books, and contending with all who presumed to differ from him, on any subject in which he took interest. He is said to have died, on the 30th of September AD. 420, aged 90 years.—*Jerome* was the best informed of all the Latin fathers, in sacred literature. The Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, were all familiar to him; and he had a very extensive acquaintance with the best writers of both the Latin and the Greek churches. He likewise possessed genius, industry, and literary enterprise, in no ordinary degree. He was also acute and discriminating; but his vivid imagination, and his choleric temper which scorned all restraint, rendered him one of the most caustic and abusive controversial writers that ever pretended to be a christian. When he has no antagonist, and sees no enemy, he is a charming writer; yet enthusiastic, and often hasty and injudicious. The greater part of his works, and particularly his translations and commentaries on the Bible, were written while he resided at Bethlehem. As given to us in the Benedictine edition, in five volumes; vol. Ist. contains his translations of the whole bible; namely, the canonical books of the O. T. from the Hebrew; also Job, Psalms, Tobit and Esther, translated from the Greek; and the whole N. T. with copious notes, from the Greek. Vol. IId. contains some glossaries, and numerous tracts and letters on a variety of subjects in sacred literature. Vol. IIId. contains his commentaries on all the Prophets. Vol. IVth. contains his commentary on Matthew, and on the Epp. to the Gal. Ephes. Titus and Philemon; and about 120 Letters and Essays, narrative, polemic, apologetic &c. The Vth. vol. contains only works falsely ascribed to *Jerome*.—See *Caze* Historia Litterar. Tillemont, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles. tom. xii. p. 1—356. *Martianay*, Vie de St. Jérôme, Paris 1706. 4to. *J. Stilling*, Acta Sanctor. Septembris, tom. viii. p. 418—688. Antw. 1762. Fol. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xi. p. 3—239. *J. Milner*, Church Hist. Cent. iv. ch. 10. Tr.]

(35) After the edition by the theologians of *Louvain*, [Antwerp, 1577. x vol. Fol.] the Benedictine monks gave a neat and accurate edition of *Augustine's* work; [Paris, 1679—1700. xi. vol. Fol.] This was reprinted with enlargements, in Holland, or as the title says, at *Antwerp*, under the eye of *Jo. le Clerc*, with the assumed name of *Jo. Phereponus*, [1700—1703, xii. vol. Fol. printed at *Amsterdam*. It was also reprinted at Venice, 1729—1735.] The Jesuits censure many things in the Benedictine edition. [They think the editors leaned too

tained considerable reputation, by his handsomely written work *on the Schism of the Donatists*.⁽³⁶⁾ *Paulinus* of Nola, has

much towards the *Jansenists*, between whom and the Jesuits there was a long and violent controversy respecting the sentiments of *Augustine*.—*Aurelius Augustinus* was born Nov. 13, AD. 354, at Tagaste, an obscure village in Numidia. His father, *Patricius*, was a pagan, till near the close of life. His mother, *Monia*, was eminently pious. He had a good school education in grammar and rhetoric; but he would not study Greek. At 15, he came home, and lived idle and vicious. At 17, he was sent to Carthage, where he shone as the first scholar in the rhetorical school. But he was dissipated, and became a Manichæan. He kept a mistress, who bore him a son when he was but 18. This son, named *Adeodatus*, was well educated, became pious, was baptized at the same time with his father, at the age of 15, and died soon after. While a student at Carthage, *Augustine* lost his father. By reading *Cicero's Hortensius*, he became enamored with philosophy; and began to read the bible, in search of it; but he could not there find that sublime system of which *Cicero* had given him an ideal, and he threw aside the sacred volume. At the age of 20 he had read and mastered nearly all the liberal sciences, as they were then taught. He now returned to Tagaste, and there opened a school for rhetoric. About the year 380, he again settled at Carthage, where he taught rhetoric about three years. During this period, his attachment to Manichæism diminished. He was restless, debauched, and unprincipled; yet was a fine scholar, and quite popular. In 383 he went to Rome, and the next year to Milan, in the character of a teacher of rhetoric. The eloquence of *Ambrose* drew him to attend public worship; and under the discourses of that able and faithful preacher, *Augustine's* mind was gradually enlightened, and his conscience awakened. He had sharp and painful convictions, and became altogether a new man. He was baptized AD. 387. set out for Africa the same year, buried his mother, stopped at Rome, and did not reach Africa till AD. 388. He sold his estate, and devoted the avails to charitable purposes; and for three years, lived as a recluse, with a few devout young men; and spent much time on scientific and metaphysical subjects. In the year 391, he went to *Hippo regius*, (now *Bona* in Algiers,) where he was made a presbyter, and preached and labored with great success. Four years after, *Valerius* his aged bishop, who was a native Greek, and who felt the need of such an assistant, as the now renowned presbyter of Hippo, caused him to be ordained his colleague bishop. From AD. 395, to AD. 430, *Augustine*, as bishop of Hippo, was indefatigable, in preaching, writing, combatting error and vice, and infusing life and spirituality into the churches and clergy, far and near. He died on the 28th of August, AD. 430, aged 76 years. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litterar. Tillemont*, *Mémoires*—a l' *Hist. Eccl.* vol. xiii. ed. Paris, (it is omitted in the Brussels ed.) *J. Stilling*, *Acta Sanctor. Augusti*, tom. vi. p. 213—460; *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xv. p. 219—530; *Jos. Milner's Church Hist.* century v. ch. 2—9; and especially, *Augustini Confessionum Libri xiii*; written about AD. 400; *Opp.* tom. i. ed. Benedict.—The works of *Augustine* are so numerous, that even their titles can not be here enumerated. Volume *first*, of the Benedictine edition, contains his *Retractations*, or corrections of his own works, in 2 Books, written AD. 426; his *Confessions*, in 13 Books; and 13 works composed before he was a presbyter, on scientific, moral, and polemic subjects. Vol. *second* contains 270 Epistles. Vol. *third* contains 16 Treatises on Biblical questions and subjects. Vol. *fourth* contains his Exposition of the Psalms. Vol. *fifth* contains 394 of his popular sermons; and 317 falsely ascribed to him. Vol. *sixth* contains 31 Tracts on moral, monastic, and practical subjects. Vol. *seventh* is occupied by his 22 Books *de Civitate Dei*, or history of the visible kingdom of God, from the creation, to the author's own times;—a most learned work. Vol. *eighth*, *ninth* and *tenth*, contain his polemic works; viz. vol. 8th against the *Manichees*, the *Arians*, the *Antitrinitarians*, the *Origenists*, and the *Jews*; vol. 9th, against the *Donatists*; and vol. 10th, against the *Pelagians*. The *eleventh* vol. contains his life, indices &c. Tr.]

(36) After the edition of *Gab. Albaspinus*, [Paris 1631, and 1679, Fol.] *Lud. Ell. du Pin*, doctor of the Sorbonne, published the works of *Optatus*, with judicious illustrations, [Paris 1700. Fol.—Of *Optatus*, about all that is known, is stated by *Jerome*, *de Viris Illust.* c. 110: namely; “that he was an African

left us some epistles and poems, which are neither very bad nor very good.(37) *Rufinus*, a presbyter of *Aquileia*, acquired fame by translating into Latin various works of the Greek fathers, in particular of *Origen*; by his bitter contests with *Jerome*; and by some expositions of the holy scriptures. He would have held no contemptible rank among the Latin writers of this century, had it not been his misfortune to have the powerful and foul-mouthed *Jerome* for his adversary.(38) For an account of

and bishop of *Milevi*, who was on the side of the catholics; and that he wrote, during the reign of *Valentinian* and *Valens*, (AD. 364—375,) six Books against the slander of the Donatists; in which he maintains that the wrong doing of the Donatists is erroneously charged on us."—His work is entitled, *Contra Parmenianum sectae Donatisticae apud Carthaginum episcopum, de Schismate Donatistarum Libri vii*. It is a polemic work, in answer to a book published by *Parmenianus*; and contains much of the history of that schism, as well as of the arguments by which each party maintained its own principles, and defended its own conduct. Tr.]

(37) The best edition of *Paulinus*, is that published by *Jo. Bapt. le Brun*, Paris, 1685, 4to. [in 2 volumes: which *L. A. Muratori* republished, with some additions, Verona, 1736, Fol.—*Meropius Pontius Anicius Paulinus*, a Roman of patrician rank, was born at Bourdeaux in France, AD. 353. He first studied under the poet *Decius Ausonius*; then went to Rome, became a popular advocate, and was made consul about the year 375. About 379, he commenced his travels or wanderings in Italy, Gaul, and Spain, accompanied with his pious wife *Theresia*. During this period he formed acquaintance with *St. Ambrose*, *St. Martin*, and many other eminent saints. He was baptized at Bourdeaux AD. 391; and gradually parting with most of his large estate, which he bestowed in charity, he retired to Barcelona in Spain, where he lived some years as a recluse or monk. In 393, he was ordained a presbyter at Barcelona. The next year he removed to *Nola* in Campania, where he had a small estate near to the grave and the church of *St. Felix*; at which numerous miracles were supposed to take place, and which of course was a great resort of the admirers of sacred relics and wonders. Here *Paulinus* in the year 402, erected an additional church, which he adorned with emblems of the Trinity and other religious devices. In 409 he became bishop of *Nola*, and remained in that office till his death in 431. He was esteemed one of the greatest saints; and was undoubtedly very religious, though his piety was of a superstitious cast. His writings consist of about 50 letters to his friends, written with a pleasing simplicity of style, and exhibiting a true picture of his devout mind, yet containing little that is of much importance; also 32 poetic effusions, of a similar character with his letters; 15 of which are in praise of *St. Felix*. He was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and by the pious in after ages. For an account of him and his works, see *Gennadius de Viris Illustribus*, c. 48, with the Notes of *Fabricius* in his *Biblioth. Patristica*; *Le Brun*, *Vita Paulini*, in his *Opp. Paulini*; *Cave*, *Historia Litterar. Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. vii. p. 123—132; *Jos. Milner*, *Church Hist.* century v. ch. 13. Tr.]

(38) *Richard Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiast.* par M. du Pin, Tome i. p. 124 &c. A particular and full account is given of him, and his reputation is defended, by *Justus Fontaninus*, *Historia Litteraria Aquileiensis*, Lib. v. p. 149. [See also *P. Th. Cacciari*, *Dissertatio Historica de Vita, Fide &c. Rufini*, subjoined to his edition of *Rufinus' Hist. Eccl.* and *de Rubeis*, *Dissert. de Tyrannio Rufino Presbytero &c.* Venice, 1754, 4to.—*Gennadius*, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 17. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 112—133. *Cave*, *Histor. Litter.*—*Rufinus Toranus*, or *Tyrannius*, was probably born at *Concordia*, near *Aquileia*, about AD. 330. After living several years in a monastery at *Aquileia*, and forming acquaintance with *Jerome*, he was baptized there in 371. Soon after, the fame of the oriental monks led him to visit them. Landing at *Alexandria*, he became acquainted with a rich Roman lady, named *Melania*, who was as great an admirer of monkery as himself. She became his patron, supported him, and travelled with him, through the remainder of his life. During his six years

Philastrius, (39) *Damasus*, (40) *Juvencus*, (41) and other writers

residence in Egypt, he spent some time among the monks in the Nitric wilderness, and also heard lectures from the famous *Didymus* of Alexandria. About the year 378, he and *Melania* removed to Jerusalem, where they spent many years. *Melania* occupied a nunnery, in which she supported a considerable number of devout sisters. *Rufinus* resided with other monks, in cells about the mount of Olives; was much respected; often visited by pilgrims; and lived in the greatest intimacy with *Jerome*, who then resided at Bethlehem. About the year 390, he was ordained a presbyter, by *John* bishop of Jerusalem: and soon after, the quarrel between him and *Jerome*, respecting *Origen's* orthodoxy, commenced. In the year 397, that controversy seemed to subside; and shortly after, *Rufinus* and *Melania* removed to Rome. Here his publications concerning *Origen*, rekindled the quarrel with *Jerome*; and both *Origen* and *Rufinus* were pronounced in the wrong by *Anastasius* the Roman pontiff. In the year 399, *Rufinus* removed to *Aquileia*; where he spent several years in translating works of *Origen*, and writing apologies for him and for himself. At length, after *Alaric* and his Goths began to lay waste all Italy, *Rufinus* and *Melania* set out for Palestine, and got as far as Sicily, where *Rufinus* closed his life AD. 410.—*Rufinus* was a man of respectable talents, of considerable learning, a handsome writer, and a very diligent scholar. His orthodoxy and his piety ought never to have been called in question. The abusive treatment he received from *Jerome*, will account for the irritation of his feelings at times, without supposing him destitute of grace.—His work which is most frequently quoted in modern times, is his ecclesiastical history. The first nine Books are a free translation of the ten Books of *Eusebius*, with considerable omissions in the latter part, and some additions in the first seven Books. The two last Books, (the 10th and 11th,) are a continuation by *Rufinus*. This work has been very severely censured; but of late, it is held to be of some value. The first good edition of it was, by *P. Th. Cacciari*, Rome 1740, 2 vol. 4to.—Besides this, *Rufinus* wrote *Vitae Patrum*, or a history of the eastern monks: often published, and of about the same value as the other works of the kind: also an exposition of the Creed; the best that has reached us, from so early an age:—two Apologies for *Origen*, and a translation of *Pamphylus' Apology* for him:—two defences of himself against *Jerome*; one of which is lost:—Commentaries on 75 of the Psalms, and on Hosea, Joel and Amos,—if they are genuine.—He translated the works of *Josephus*; the *Recognitions of Clement*; various Commentaries of *Origen*, and his iv Books de Principiis; several works of *Basil the Great*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Anatolius*, and *Evagrius*.—An imperfect collection of his works was published by *de la Barre*, Paris 1580, Fol. A much better edition in 2 vol. Fol. was commenced at Verona, by *Domin. Vallarsi*, of which the first vol. appeared in 1745. Tr.]

(39) [*Philastrius*, or *Philaster*, bishop of *Brescia* in the north of Italy, AD. 379—387. While a presbyter, he is said to have travelled nearly all over the Roman empire, combatting and endeavoring to convert errorists of every sort, and especially Arians. At Milan he was severely handled by *Auxentius* the Arian bishop. *Ambrose*, the successor of *Auxentius*, shewed him kindness, and ordained him bishop of *Brescia*. His praises are told by *Gaudentius*, his immediate successor in the see of *Brescia*. His only work is, *de Haeresibus Liber*, in 150 chapters. It enumerates more heresies than any of the other ancient works; but no one considers it an accurate and able work. *Philastrius* was doubtless a pious and well meaning man; but he was incompetent to the task he undertook. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.* and *Schroeckh*, *Kirkengesch.* vol ix. p. 302—384. The work is extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 701. and ed. Helmstadt, 1611. 4to. and by *J. A. Fabricius*, Hamb. 1721. 8vo. and among the collected Works of the early bishops of *Brescia*, *Brixiae* 1738. Fol. Tr.]

(40) [*Damasus*, bishop of Rome AD. 366—384, is said to have been of Spanish extract, but his father was a presbyter of Rome; and he was probably born there about the year 305. On the death of *Felix*, AD. 366, there was great competition for the episcopal chair; and two bishops were chosen and ordained, namely *Damasus* and *Ursinus* or *Ursicinus*. Much confusion and even bloodshed followed. But the party of *Damasus* finally triumphed. *Damasus* was active in putting down Arianism in the West; and being requested, he aided the eastern churches in healing their divisions. For these purposes he held several councils, and wrote several letters, some of which are extant. Two synodic epistles and

of less note, the reader is referred to those who professedly treat of all the christian writers. I will, however, just mention *Sulpitius Severus*, a Gaul, and a very good historian;(42) and *Prudentius*, a Spaniard, and a poet of considerable merit.(43)

a confession of faith are preserved by *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 22. and L. v. c. 10, 11. An epistle to *Paulinus* bishop of Antioch, and about 40 epitaphs, inscriptions, epigrams &c. are also extant. His Book *de virginitate* is lost. Several spurious epistles, as well as the *Liber Pontificalis*, or Brief History of the Popes, are falsely ascribed to him. The best edition of his works is that by *A. M. Merenda*, Rome 1754. Fol. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 103. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, vol. i. p. 179—233. ed. 2d Lond. 1749. *Merenda*, in his ed. of the works of *Damasus*, and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. viii. p. 107—122. Tr.]

(41) [*Caius Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus*. Nearly all that is known of the man, is told by *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 84. He says: "*Juvencus*, of noble extract, a Spaniard, and a presbyter, composed iv Books, in which the iv Gospels are put into hexameter verse, almost verbatim; also some poems in the same measure, relating to the order of the sacraments. He flourished under the emperor *Constantine*." The iv Books of Evangelical History are of the nature of an imperfect Harmony of the Gospels, on the basis of Matthew. *Juvencus* possessed considerable poetic genius, and understood versification very well. His lines are flowing and easy; but he was more solicitous to give the history, truly, and as nearly as possible in the language of the Bible, than to decorate the narrative by flights of fancy and poetic imagery. The best edition is that of *Erh. Reusch*, Francf. and Leips. 1710. 8vo. The other poems mentioned by *Jerome*, are lost. But in the *Nova Collectio vett. Monumentorum*, tom. ix. p. 15 &c. by *Edw. Martene*, Paris 1724—33, there is a poetic version of the book of Genesis, which bears the name of *Juvencus*. See *Cave*, Historia Litterar. and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. v. p. 262—265. Tr.]

(42) [*Sulpitius Severus* was born in Aquitain Gaul, of noble extract, and brought up under *Phaebadius* bishop of Agen in Guienne. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards became an advocate, and married a lady of consular rank. Subsequently he became a monk under *St. Martin*, and a presbyter at Primulum, a village between Narbonne and Toulouse. He was intimate with *St. Martin* of Tours, *Paulinus* of Nola, and *Jerome*. In his old age, *Gennadius* tells us, he was intangled by the metaphysics of the Pelagians; but recovering himself, he ever after kept silence. He is supposed to have died about AD. 420, far advanced in life. His style is chaste and neat, much beyond the age in which he lived: whence he has been called the christian *Sallust*. His best work is a Church History, *Historia Sacra*, in ii Books, from the creation, to AD. 400. It is a condensed narrative, in a very classic style, and composed with some ability and fidelity. Besides this, he wrote the Life of *St. Martin*; three epistles concerning him; and three dialogues on the miracles of the oriental monks, and on those of *St. Martin*. Several epistles of his are lost. To him *Paulinus* of Nola addressed 14 epistles, which are still extant. His works have been often printed. The last edition, perhaps, is that of *G. Hornius*, Lugd. Bat. 1647. 4to; often reprinted, 8vo. See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr. c. 19. *Cave*, Historia Litteraria. Tr.]

(43) [*Aurelius Prudentius Clemens*, of Spain, was born AD. 348; but whether at Tarragona, Calahorra, or Saragossa, is not settled. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards managed causes and filled civil offices, as an unprincipled man. He was openly vicious, and he served some time in the army. At length, when turned of 50, he became thoughtful, his whole character was changed, and he devoted himself to writing moral and religious poetry. In the year 405, he wrote *Καθήμενῶν*, or 12 Latin hymns, adapted to our daily devotions. His other poems are, *Ψυχομαχία*, or the conflict between virtuous and vicious passions; *περὶ τεφάνων*, or fourteen elegies on various martyrs; *ἀποθέωσις*, or on the divine nature, in opposition to pagans and heretics; *ἀμαρτηγενεία*, or the origin of sin; ii Books against *Symmachus*, and the worship of idols; and, (if it be genuine,) *διεσποχαιῶν*, or a *dessert*, taken from the O. and N. Testament; some write it *δίπτυχον*, the *Diptyc* or list of saints in the

O. and N. Testaments. His commentary on the hexaemeron, is lost. *Prudentius* was something of a poet; but has been greatly overrated by many. His diction is not pure, nor his versification correct, and his thoughts are often flat prose, and drag along to excessive length. A good critic has observed, that, he was a better christian than poet. Yet he has many agreeable passages, and some that are really fine. He also serves to illustrate the history and the religious views of the age in which he lived. His collected works were published, by *Weitzen*, Hanov. 1613. 8vo; with notes by *Heinsius*, Amstelod. 1667. 12mo; and in *usum Delphini*, Paris 1687, 4to.—See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr. c. 13. *Cave*, Hist. Litterar. *Schroecckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. vii. p. 100—123.

The Latin writers of inferior note, omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*, are the following.

Anastasia, a noble Roman lady, the wife of *Publius*, and a martyr in the Diocletian persecution AD. 303. Two letters addressed from her prison to *Chrysogonus*, a confessor, are extant under her name. See *Suidas*, in voce *χρυσόγονος*.

Theonas, a bishop, but where, is not known. An excellent letter of his addressed to *Lucian*, the emperor's chamberlain, is extant in *Dacherii* Addit. ad Spicileg. tom. xi. or the new ed. tom. iii. p. 297. It is supposed to have been written about AD. 305. But whether the present Latin is the original, or only a translation, is uncertain. See *Cave*, Hist. Litterar. vol. i. p. 172, 173.

Rheticus bishop of *Autun* in France. He was in high esteem during the reign of *Constantine*; and wrote a commentary on the Canticles, and a great volume against the Novatians; both of which are lost. *Jerome* de Viris Illustr. c. 82.

Donatus, an African bishop, from whom the *Donatist* faction took its name. According to *Jerome*, (de Viris Illustr. c. 93,) he wrote many tracts in support of his sect, and likewise a book on the Holy Spirit, which accorded with Arian views. None of his works are extant. He was expelled from Carthage AD. 356.

Julius, bishop of Rome, AD. 337—352, a strenuous opposer of the Arians, and a patron of *Athanasius*. Two of his epistles are extant, one, addressed to the oriental bishops, and the other, to the Alexandrians, in favor of *Athanasius*. Both are preserved in the works of *Athanasius*, and the latter also by *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl. Lib. ii. c. 22. See *Cave*, Hist. Literar. and *Boicer*, Lives of the Popes.

Julius Firmicus Maternus, probably was first a pagan, and then a christian. He wrote a book on the falsehood of the pagan religions, addressed to the emperors *Constantius* and *Constans*, which has been often printed. There are extant, likewise, viii Books on astronomy or mathematics, which bear his name.

Fortunatianus, born in Africa, and for many years bishop of *Aquileia* in Italy. After contending long and strenuously against the Arians, he joined with them in 354, and became as active against the orthodox. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels: but nothing of his remains.

Vitellius, an African Donatist, who flourished about AD. 344. He wrote on the world's hatred to the servants of God; against the pagans; against the Catholics as traitors; and some other tracts. See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr. c. 4. Nothing of his remains.

Macrobius of Africa. As a catholic presbyter, he wrote a book addressed to confessors and virgins; afterwards, as a Donatist bishop resident at Rome, he composed the martyrdom of *Maximianus* and *Isaac*, two Donatists. A large fragment of the last, is extant in *Mabillon*, Analect. tom. iv. He flourished AD. 344.

Liberius, bishop of Rome, AD. 352—366. He had a warm discussion with the emperor *Constantius*, in the year 355, at Milan, respecting the persecution of the orthodox by the Arians, for his opposition to which, he was banished. During his exile, he relapsed, signed an Arian creed; and was restored, AD. 356. His dialogue with the emperor at Milan, is extant, in *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 16. and 16 of his epistles are collected in the *Acta Concil.* Tom. ii. col. 743.

Eusebius Vercellensis, was a native of Sardinia, and first a lector at Rome, then bishop of *Vercelli* in the north of Italy, and flourished AD. 354. For his vigorous opposition to the Arian cause, he was banished in 355, first to *Scythopolis* in Syria, thence to Cappadocia, and afterwards to Thebais in Egypt. Under *Julian*; he regained his liberty, travelled extensively in the eastern provinces, was at several councils, and returning to Italy, died AD. 371. He translated the commentary on the Psalms, by *Eusebius Caesariensis*, into Latin; but it is lost: and wrote four letters, which are still extant. A manuscript of the iv

Evangelists, according to the old Italic version, written with his own hand, is preserved in the archives of the church of Vercelli, and was published by *J. A. Irici*, Milan. 1748.

Lucifer Caralitanus, a bishop in Sardinia, contemporary with *Eusebius Vercellensis*, and his companion in exile. He was founder of the sect called *Luciferians*, who held no communion with Arians, or even with such as had been Arians. *Lucifer* was a man of violent passions, and bold even to rashness. He addressed two indecorously written books to the emperor *Constantius*; and wrote likewise, *On apostate Princes*; *On having no intercourse with heretics*; *On showing no indulgence to offenders against God*; *That life is to be sacrificed for the Son of God*; and a short *Epistle to Florentius*. These were published, Paris 1568. 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 181; but the best ed. is by *Joh. Dominic*, and *Ju. Coleti*, Venice 1778. Fol.

Hilarius, a native of Sardinia, deacon at Rome, and associated with *Eusebius Vercell.* and *Lucifer Caralit.* in an embassy to *Constantius*, and by him sent with them into exile. He became a *Luciferian*. To him are attributed—though without sufficient proof—the Questions on the Old and New Testaments, printed among the works of *Augustine*, vol. iv. and the Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, published among the works of *Ambrose*.

Phaebadius bishop of *Agen* in the south of France, from, at least, 359—392. He was famous, in connexion with the three preceding, in the Arian contests in the West. His Book against the Arians, is still extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. iv. p. 300. ed. Paris 1589; and by *Casp. Barth*, Francf. 1623. 8vo.

Zeno bishop of Verona, who flourished about AD. 390. To him are ascribed 90 sermons on various texts and subjects, which were compiled from *Basil*, *Hilary*, and others. They are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. iii. p. 359.

Fabius Marius Victorinus, of African birth, was a distinguished pagan rhetorician at Rome, who became a convert to christianity about the middle of this century, and died about AD. 370. While a pagan, he wrote or translated several treatises on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric; most of which are lost. After his conversion, he wrote, on the holy Trinity; against the Arians, iv Books; to *Justin* the Manichæan; against the Manichæan principle of two first causes; on the commencement of the day; whether it be at evening, or in the morning; on the generation of the divine Word; against *Candidus* the Arian: three hymns; on embracing the homousian faith: a Poem on the seven Maccabees: and Commentaries on some of Paul's epistles; which were never published. His style is intricate, obscure, and inelegant. Most of what he wrote after his conversion, is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. iv. p. 293. See *Jerome*, de *Viris Illustr.* c. 101. and the Notes of *J. A. Fabricius*.

Candidus, an Arian, who flourished about AD. 364. He composed a book on the divine generation, addressed to *F. M. Victorinus*, which, with the answer of *Victorinus*, was published by *Andr. Rivinus*, Gothæ 1656.

Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona in Spain, who flourished about the year 370, and died before AD. 390. He wrote a book, called *Cerrus*, which is lost; also three epistles against the Novatians; an Exhortation to penitence; and a tract on Baptism, addressed to catechumens: all of which were published, Paris 1538. 4to. Rome 1564. Fol. *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. iv. and still better, in *Aguirre*, *Collectio Max. Concil. Hispan.* Tom. ii. p. 79 &c.

Anicia Falconia Proba, a noble lady of Rome, distinguished for her rank, her piety, and her beneficence. She flourished about AD. 370. After the death of her husband, she lost most of her property by the incursion of the Goths, and fell into the hands of *Alaric*, who carried her to Africa, where she died in the first part of the fifth century. Her *Cento Virgilianus de rebus divinis*, is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. v. p. 1218. and Cologne 1601. 8vo. and Halle 1719. 8vo.

Faustinus, a presbyter among the *Luciferians* at Rome, flourished AD. 384. He wrote a Petition to the emperors *Valentinian*, *Theodosius*, and *Arcadius*; to which is prefixed a Confession of faith; and subjoined is, the Rescript of *Theodosius*. He also wrote a book on the Trinity, against the Arians. His works are in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. v. p. 673. and were printed, Oxford 1678. 8vo.

Siricius, bishop of Rome AD. 385—398, is the earliest Roman pontiff whose Decretal Epistles are allowed to be genuine. Five of his Epistles are in the *Acta Concilior.* Tom. ii. but the 4th, which is addressed to the bishops of Africa, is

demonstrably spurious. See *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. viii. p. 122—129; and *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 233—277.

Idacius Clarus was a Spanish bishop, perhaps of Merida, and flourished AD. 385. He was conspicuous as an opposer of the Priscillianists; suffered banishment; and wrote an Apologeticum, which is lost; a book against *Virimundus*, an Arian deacon; Explanation of some difficult passages of scripture; and other tracts against heresies: all of which are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. v. p. 726.

Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia in northern Italy, (a different person from *Gaudentius*, a contemporary Donatist bishop of Tamugada in Africa,) was travelling in the Asiatic provinces, when he was elected successor to *Philastrius* bishop of Brescia, and was compelled to return and accept the office. He brought with him from the East, relics of about 40 saints: and served the church till AD. 410; or, as some say, till 427. He wrote 15 discourses or tracts on various subjects: also, On the unjust steward; On the text, My Father is greater than I; and the Life of Philastrius: all published, Petav. 1720. 4to.

Aurclius, bishop of Carthage AD. 390—426, was a man of much influence, and wrote, AD. 419, a circular Epistle on the condemnation of *Pelagius* and *Coelestius*; which, with the letter of the emperor *Honorius* to him, on the same subject, is in *Baronius*, *Annals*, AD. 419. p. 455. and in the *Concil. Collect.* Tom. ii. col. 1609.

Tichonius, or *Tychonius*, flourished AD. 390. He was a learned, moderate, Donatist; and wrote vii Rules for interpreting scripture, (extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. vi. p. 49.) III Books on intestine war; Explanation of divers causes; and a Commentary on the Apocalypse. Some have supposed, the 18 Lectures on the Apocalypse, printed among the works of Augustine, to be this Commentary of *Tichonius*. See *Gennadius*, de *Viris Illustr.* c. 18. *Augustine*, de *Doctrina christiana*, L. iii. c. 30. and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xi. p. 374—382.

Petilianus, a leading Donatist bishop in Numidia, flourished AD. 399. He wrote, de uno Baptismo; and a circular Epistle to his party: to both which *Augustine* wrote formal answers. His works are lost.

Faustus, a Manichaeun bishop in Africa, flourished AD. 400. He wrote a book against the orthodox faith; which *Augustine* quotes entire, and refutes at large, in 33 Books. Tr.]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of theological learning.—§ 2. Increase of superstition.—§ 3. Hence innumerable pious frauds.—§ 4. Interpreters of the sacred volume.—§ 5. Mode of explaining the christian doctrines.—§ 6. Doctrinal writers.—§ 7. State of controversial theology.—§ 8. Disingenuous methods of disputing.—§ 9. The principal disputants.—§ 10. Practical theology.—§ 11. Faults of the moral writers.—§ 12. The number of mystics increased, and their doctrines established.—§ 13, 14. Monkish societies.—§ 15. Different orders of monks.—§ 16. Two pernicious moral doctrines.—§ 17. Lives and morals of christians.—§ 18. Controversy with Meletians.—§ 19. The Eustathian troubles.—§ 20. The Luciferians.—§ 21. The Arian controversy.—§ 22. Jovinianus.—§ 23. Controversies relating to Origen.—§ 24. Their extension.—§ 25. Controversy respecting his writings.

§ 1. That the elementary principles of the christian religion were preserved entire and inviolate, in most churches, is certain : but it is equally certain, that they were very often unskilfully and confusedly explained and defended. This is manifest from the discussions concerning the three persons in the Godhead, among those who approved the decisions of the council of Nice. There is so little clearness and discrimination in these discussions, that they seem to rend the one God into *three* Gods. Moreover those idle fictions, which a regard for the Platonic philosophy and for the prevailing opinions of the day had induced most theologians to embrace, even before the times of *Constantine*, were now in various ways confirmed, extended, and embellished. Hence it is that we see, on every side, evident traces of excessive veneration for departed saints, of a purifying fire for souls when separate from the body, of the celibacy of the clergy, of the worship of images and relics, and of many other opinions, which in process of time almost banished the true religion, or at least very much obscured and corrupted it.

§ 2. Genuine piety was supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which were derived, partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites, and combine them with christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind in general for a splendid and ostentatious religion. At first, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs ; as if, *thence* men could bear away the radical principles of holiness, and certain hopes of salvation.(1) Next, from

(1) See *Gregory Nyssen*, Oratio ad eos qui Hierosolymam adeunt ; Opp. Tom. iii. p. 568. *Hieronymus*, Ep. xiii. ad Paulinum, de institut. Monachi ; Opp. Tom. i. p. 66. *Ja. Godfrey*, ad Codicem Theodos. Tom. vi. p. 65 &c. *Peter Wesse-*

Palestine and from places venerated for their sanctity, portions of dust or of earth were brought; as if, they were the most powerful protection against the assaults of evil spirits; and these were bought and sold every where at great prices.(2) Further, the public supplications, by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated in due form, and to the images of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed, and the same privileges assigned, as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues and lustrations, before the advent of *Christ*. Images indeed were as yet but rare; and statues did not exist. And shameful as it may appear, it is beyond all doubt, that the worship of the martyrs,—with no bad intentions indeed, yet to the great injury of the christian cause,—was modelled by degrees into conformity with the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods.(3) From these specimens, the intelligent reader will be able to conceive, how much injury resulted to christianity, from the peace and repose procured by *Constantine*, and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the pagans to embrace this religion. But the plan of this work will not admit of long details respecting such enormities.

§ 3. This unenlightened piety of the common people, opened a wide door to the endless frauds of persons who were base enough to take advantage of the ignorance and errors of others, disingenuously to advance their own interests. Rumors were artfully disseminated of prodigies and wonders to be seen in certain edifices and places, (a trick before this time practiced by the pagan priests,) whereby the infatuated populace were drawn together, and the stupidity and ignorance of those who looked upon every thing new and unusual as a miracle, were often wretchedly imposed upon.(4) Graves of saints and martyrs were supposed to be where they were not;(5) the list of saints was enriched with

ling, Diss. de caussis peregrinat. Hierosolymit. prefixed to the Itinerarium Burdigalense; among the Vetera Romanor. Itineraria, p. 537.—[*Helena*, the mother of *Constantine* the Great, seems to have been the first who gave the signal for these religious journies. At least, it is stated by *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl. L. i. c. 17. and by *Theodoret*, II. E. Lib. i. c. 18. that she was instructed by a dream to go to Jerusalem, and that she wished to find the grave of *Christ*; that she actually did find three crosses, with a superscription; that one of them instantly cured a dying woman, and was therefore concluded to be the cross of *Christ*. She gave a part of it to the city of Jerusalem; and sent the other part to the emperor, who incased it in his own statue, and regarded it as the *Palladium* of his new city; and that the people used to assemble around this statue with wax candles. See *J. Andr. Schmidt*, Problem. de crucis Dominicae per Helenam Constantini Imp. matrem inventionem, Helmst. 1724. *Schl.*]

(2) *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, L. xxii. c. 8. § 6. and many others.

(3) This is shown at length, by *Is. de Beausobre*, Histoire du Manicheisme, Tom. ii. p. 642 &c.

(4) *Henry Dodwell's* Dissertat. ii. in Irenaeum, § 56. p. 196 &c. *Jo. le Clerc*, in his Appendix Augustiniana, p. 492, 550, 575.

(5) Concilium Carthagin. v. Canon 14. Tom. i. Conciliorum, p. 988. ed. Harduin.

fictitious names; and even robbers were converted into martyrs.(6) Some buried blood-stained bones in retired places, and then gave out that they had been informed in a dream, that the corpse of some friend of God was there interred.(7) Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces, and not only shamelessly carried on a traffic in fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude with ludicrous combats with evil spirits.(8) It would require a volume to detail the various impositions which were, for the most part, successfully practiced by artful knaves, after genuine piety and true religion were compelled to resign their dominion in great measure to superstition.

§ 4. Many labored earnestly, few successfully, on the sacred volume. *Jerome*, a man of great industry, and not unskilful in the languages, made a new Latin translation of the sacred books; which was more lucid, and considerably better than any of the numerous old Latin versions.(9) He also took much pains to set forth a more correct edition of the Greek version by the Seventy: and the same thing, we are told, was undertaken by *Eusebius*, *Athanasius*, and *Euthalius*.(10) The expositors of scripture form a long list; among whom the most distinguished

(6) *Sulpitius Severus*, de Vita S. Martini, cap. 8.

(7) *Augustine*, Sermo 318, § 1. Opp. Tom. v. p. 886. ed. Antwerp.

(8) See *Ja. Godfrey*, ad Codicem Theodos. Tom. iii. p. 172. *Augustine*, de opere Monachorum, cap. 28. § 36, Opp. Tom. vi. p. 364. *Jerome*, Epistola ad Rusticum; Opp. Tom. i. p. 45.

(9) See *Ja. Fran. Buddeus*, Isagoge ad Theologiam, Tom. ii. p. 1332 &c.—[That there were many Latin versions extant in the fourth century, is very clearly stated by *Augustine*, de Doctrina christiana, L. ii. c. 11. Of these, (as *Augustine* tells us, loc. cit.) one was called (*Itala*) the *Italic*. But it has become usual to apply this designation to every ancient Latin version, which was not amended by *Jerome*; and this has given occasion to many mistakes. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christianor. ante Const. M. p. 225—229. *Jerome* mentions a version, which he calls (*Vulgata*) the *vulgar*, and which counsellor *Michaelis* takes to be that used at Rome in the days of *Jerome*. These translations, in respect to their diction, were neither classical nor tolerable; yet they may be of use to those who wish to become acquainted with the Latin language in its fullest extent. They contain an immense number of Hebraisms, or rather Syriacisms; which leads to the conjecture, that their authors were in great measure Jews. These versions fell into great disorder, in which no two copies were alike; because different translations were in fact blended together, the words of one Evangelist were transferred into the narrative of another, and many glosses were incorporated into the text. This induced the Roman bishop *Damasus* to commit the improving of these ancient versions to *Jerome*, who undertook the business in the year 384. He erased the false and incorrect readings, and improved the translations, which came into his hands very faulty, uniformly guiding himself by the original text. This improved version of *Jerome* is, a few alterations excepted, that *Vulgate* which is held in so high estimation by the Catholic church. The really new translation of the bible by *Jerome*, was published from manuscripts, by the Benedictine monks *Jo. Martianay* and *Ant. Pouget*, Paris 1693. under the title: Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi divina Bibliotheca, hac tenus inedita. Their Prolegomena are worth reading. See *Rich. Simon*, Histoire critique des Versions du nouveau Test. cap. 7—12. and *Michaelis*, Introduction to the N. T. Schl.]

(10) *Jo. Frick*, de Canone Novi Testamenti, p. 180.

are *Jerome*, *Hilary*, *Eusebius*, *Diodorus* of Tarsus, *Rufinus*, *Ephraem* Syrus, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius*, and *Didymus*. Yet few of these have correctly discharged the duty of interpreters. *Rufinus*, indeed, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Diodorus*, and a few others, followed the literal sense of scripture : (11) the rest, after the example of *Origen* their guide, search for recondite meanings; and accommodate, or rather constrain, the half understood language of the bible, to speak of sacred mysteries and a christian life. (12) *Augustine* and *Tychonius*, wished to establish rules for interpretation; but neither of them had ability to do it. (13)

§ 5. The doctors who were distinguished for their learning, explained the sacred doctrines, after the manner of *Origen*, (on whom they all fixed their eye,) in accordance with the principles of that philosophy, which they learned in their youth at school, namely, the Platonic philosophy as corrected by *Origen*. Those who wish to get a full insight into this subject, may examine *Gregory* Nazianzen among the Greeks, and *Augustine* among the Latins; who were regarded in the subsequent ages as the only patterns worthy of imitation, and may be fitly styled, next to *Origen*, the parents and supporters of philosophic or *scholastic* theology. They were both admirers of *Plato*, and held as certain all his decisions which were not absolutely repugnant to the truths of christianity: and proceeding upon these as their first principles, they drew from them many and very subtile conclusions. Yet there was another class of theologians, which daily increased in number; namely, that of men who supposed the knowledge of divine things was to be acquired, not by *reasoning* about them, but by *contemplation*, and by recalling the mind from its converse with external objects to a concentration on itself. These are commonly called *mystics*. That these abounded, appears from several considerations, and particularly, from the numerous herds of monks who were spread nearly all over the christian world; and from the works of *Dionysius*, that Coryphaeus of the mystics, which were produced, it seems, in this age, and by some one of this class.

§ 6. Among the writings of this age, in which the doctrines of christianity are stated and explained, the first place is justly due to the catechetical Discourses of *Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem. For those who would persuade us, that these Discourses were the

(11) *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiast. par. M. du Pin, Tom. i. p. 51, 90, 129. and Tom. iv. p. 335 &c. and Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. cap. vi &c. p. 88 &c.

(12) See *Gregory* Nazianzen, Carmen de se ipso; in *Ja. Tollii* Insignib. Itineris Italici, p. 27, 57. He very much commends this method.

(13) *Augustine*, in his vi. Books de Doctrina christiana; *Tychonius*, in his vii. Rules of Interpretation; which are extant in the Biblioth. Patrum maxima, Tom. vi. p. 48.

production of a subsequent age, are so blinded by zeal for a party, as not to discern the truth.(14) Many would also here place the Divine Institutions of *Lactantius*; but improperly, because these Institutes were designed rather to confute those who still adhered to polytheism, than to unfold the truths taught by inspiration. The System of Doctrine addressed to the clergy and laity, which is ascribed to *Athanasius*, appears to have been the production of a later age.(15) There are however, in the works of *Athanasius*, *Chrysostom*, the *Gregories*, and others, as now extant, many passages from which we may learn how the best informed men of this age handled the leading topics of the christian religion. On the *Trinity*, in particular, we have the twelve Books of *Hilary* of Poitiers. The Anconatus of *Epiphanius* explains the doctrine concerning *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. On *baptism*, we have the work of *Pacianus*, addressed to the catechumens; and a work of *Chrysostom*, on the same subject, in two Books. The works of *Jerome*, *Augustine*, and others, which were designed to impart correct views on religious subjects, and to confute the opposers of the truth, are here omitted.

§ 7. From the disputes with those who were regarded as opposed to divine truth, the ancient simplicity had nearly taken its flight; and in place of it, dialectical subtilties and quibbles, invectives, and other disingenuous artifices had succeeded, more becoming the patrons, than the opposers of error. Censures of this habit, by men of eminence, are still extant.(16) I pass in silence those rhetorical figures and flourishes, by which many endeavored to parry the weapons of their adversaries, and to involve in obscurity the question under discussion; likewise the inclination to excite odium against their antagonists, so common to many; and the disregard of proper arrangement and of perspicuity, and other habits which were no better in their discussions. Yet so far were some writers of this century from disguising these faults, that they rather claimed praise for them. It must be owned, however, that their antagonists made use of the same weapons.

§ 8. With the ancient form of discussion, new *sources of argument* were in this age combined. For the truth of doctrines was proved by the number of martyrs who had believed so, by prodigies, and by the confessions of devils, that is, of persons in whose bodies some demon was supposed to reside. The discerning cannot but see, that all proofs drawn from such sources are

(14) See *Jo. Fecht*, Comment. de origine Missarum in honorem Sanctorum, p. 404 &c.

(15) [It is not so much a treatise on dogmatics, as one on morals, containing rules of life, especially for monks. *Schl.*]

(16) *Methodius*, cited by *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* 64. *Opp.* tom. i. p. 563: *Gregory Nazianzen*, in many places: and others.

very fallacious, and very convenient for dishonest men who would practice imposition. And I greatly fear, that most of those who at this time resorted to such proofs, notwithstanding they were grave and eminent men, may be justly charged with the dangerous propensity to use deception. *Ambrose*, in controversy with the Arians, brings forward persons possessed with devils, who are constrained, when the relics of *Gervasius* and *Protasius* are produced, to cry out, that the doctrine of the Nicene council, concerning three persons in the Godhead, is true and divine, and the doctrine of the Arians false and pernicious. This testimony of the prince of darkness, *Ambrose* regards as proof altogether unexceptionable. But the Arians openly ridiculed the prodigy; and maintained, that *Ambrose* had bribed these infernals to bear testimony in his favor.(18) And many, I am aware, will be more inclined to believe the Arians, than to give credit to *Ambrose*; notwithstanding he is enrolled among saints, and they among heretics.(19)

§ 9. Besides *Apollinaris*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Cyril* of Alexandria, and others, who confuted the emperor *Julian*; the adherents to idolatry were vigorously and successfully encountered by *Lactantius*, by *Athanasius*, by *Julius Firmicus Maternus*, by the younger *Apollinaris*, whose books against *Porphyry* are unhappily lost, by *Augustine*, in his twenty two Books on the City of God, and in his three lost Books against the pagans, and above all, by *Eusebius* of Cesarea, in his Evangelical Preparation, and in his book against *Hierocles*. Attempts to convert the Jews were made by *Eusebius* of Emessa, by *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and by *Chrysostom*, in his six Books still extant. Against all the heresies, *Ephraem Syrus*,(20) *James* of Nisibis, *Didymus*, and *Audentius* took up the pen. So did *Epiphanius*, in his extensive work on the heresies, which he denominated Panarium: and *Gregory Nazianzen*, more concisely, in his Oration on the Faith. The short works of *Augustine* and *Philastrius*, rather enumerate the heresies, than confute them.

§ 10. The state of moral or practical theology would have been very flourishing, if the progress of any branch of knowledge could be measured by the number of the writers on it; for very many labored to perfect and inculcate practical religion. Among the orientals, the efforts of *James* of Nisibis, or as so ne say, of *Saruga*,(21) and *Ephraem Syrus*, were very considerable in this

(18) *Ambrose*, Epist. xxii. p. 878 &c. *Paulinus*, de Vita Ambrosii, p. 81.

(19) See *Jo. le Clerc*, Appendix Augustiniana, p. 375. More examples of this kind might be mentioned. See *Gregory Nyssen*, de Vita Gregorii Caesariensis, Opp. tom. ii. p. 977, 978: *Sulpitius Sererus*, Historia Sacra, L. ii. c. 38. p. 261.

(20) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i. p. 118, 125 &c. From his extracts, it appears that *Ephraem*, though a pious man was not a dexterous polemic.

(21) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, in his Biblioth. Orient. &c. tom. i. p. 17. thinks, that

department. What we meet with, respecting the life and duties of a christian, in the writings of *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nys-sen*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others, can neither be altogether approved, nor wholly condemned. Many give the preference to the three Books of *Ambrose*, on the duties of ministers of the church, which are written after the manner of *Cicero* : and they certainly deserve commendation, so far as the intentions of the writer, and the elegance of his thoughts are concerned ; but they contain many things, which may justly be censured. Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to *Macarius*, the Egyptian monk ;(22) from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savors too much of Origenism, we may collect a beautiful picture of real piety.

§ 11. About all the writers in this department, are defective in the following respects. First, they pay no regard to method and just arrangement, in respect to the subject they attempt to explain. They rarely define, and never divide their subject, but pour out promiscuously whatever comes up in their pious, but not very clear and correct minds. In the next place, they either neglect to trace the duties of men back to their sources, and their first principles, or they derive them from precepts and doctrines which are either manifestly false, or not fully ascertained. Lastly, when they come to the proof of their positions, most of them do not resort to the law of God for arguments to enforce duty and put down vice, but to airy fancies, to frigid allegories, and fine spun subtleties, better suited to tickle the imagination than to awaken and overpower the conscience.

§ 12. But these works are far more tolerable, than that combination of the precepts of *Christ* with those of *Plato*, or rather with those of the Alexandrine philosophers the followers of *Ammonius Sacas* ; and that two-fold kind of piety, the one more perfect and complete, and the other less so ; which almost all now embraced. How very much these views of religion had gained ground, may appear from the fact, that those who had long cried up a sort of recondite and mysterious knowledge of divine things, wholly different from the common knowledge of the vulgar, were bold enough in this century, to attempt to perfect their views and to reduce them to a regular system. It is most probable, that it was among the Greeks of this century, (though some think it was earlier, and some that it was later,) lived that fanatic, who assumed the name and the character of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, the disciple of *St. Paul* ; and who under the cover of this shield

the writings ascribed to *James* of *Nisibis*, should rather be ascribed to a person of *Saruga*. But in his addenda, p. 558, he corrects his opinion, in some measure.

(22) See the acta Sanctorum, Januarii, tom. i. p. 1005.

gave laws and instructions to those that wished to become separated from the world, and by means of contemplation to bring back the soul—that sundered particle of the divine nature—to its pristine state.(23) As soon as the writings of this man passed into the hands of the Greeks and Syrians, and especially into those of the solitaries and monks, it is not easy to describe, how much darkness spread over the minds of many, and what an increase of numbers there was among those who maintained, that converse with God is to be had by mortifying the senses, withdrawing the thoughts from all external objects, subduing the body with hunger and hardships, and fixing the attention on God and eternal things, in a kind of holy indolence.

§ 13. The truth of these remarks is evinced, by that vast multitude of monks and sacred virgins who spread themselves, as soon as peace was given to the christians, with astonishing rapidity, over the whole christian world. Many persons of this description had long been known among the christians, living as solitaries in the deserts of Egypt. *Antony* was the first, who in the year 305, collected them into an associated community in Egypt, and regulated their mode of living by fixed rules.(24) His disciple *Hilarion*, the next year, undertook the same thing in Palestine and Syria. About the same time, *Aones* or *Eugenius*, with his associates *Gaddana* and *Azyzo*, introduced this mode of life into Mesopotamia and the neighboring countries.(25) These were

(23) Those who have written concerning this deceiver, are enumerated by *Jo. Fran. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad theologiam*, L. ii. c. iv. § 8 p. 602 &c. See also *Jo. Launoi*, *Judicium de scriptis Dionysii*; *Opp. tom. ii. P. i. p. 562*. *Matur. Veiss de la Croze*, in his *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*, p. 10 &c. endeavors to prove that *Synesius*, a celebrated philosopher and bishop in Egypt, of the fifth century, was the author of the Dionysian writings; and that he designed by them to support the doctrine of but *one nature* in Christ. But he uses feeble arguments. Nor are those more substantial, by which *Jo. Phil. Baratier* (in his *Diss. subjoined to his book de successione Romanor. Episcop. p. 286.*) endeavors to prove, that *Dionysius* of Alexandria was the true author of those writings.—[The real author of these works is wholly unknown. That he was not *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, mentioned *Acts xvii. 34.* as he pretends to be, and was generally believed to be, from the sixth century on to the fifteenth, is certain. That he was a Greek who lived sometime in the fourth century, is generally admitted; though some place him a century later. That he was *Apollinaris* senior, or junior, of Laodicea, several have labored to evince; but without much success. He was orthodox, pious, and certainly not destitute of talent. His works consist of single Books, on the Coelestial Hierarchy, or the invisible world, or the church above; on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, or the visible church of God on the earth, its order, worship, and ordinances; on the Divine Names, or the designations of God in the scriptures; on Mystical Theology, or on the perfections of God; and eleven Epistles. These, with the commentaries of some of the later Greek theologians, and notes by the moderns, were printed Gr. and Lat. Antwerp 1634, and Paris 1644. 2 vol. Fol. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar. Daillé*, *de Scriptis Dionysii Areopagitae*, *Genevae 1666. 4to. Bp. Pearson*, *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, P. i. c. 10. *Tr.*]

(24) *Antony* and his regulations are treated of in the *Acta Sanctor. ad diem 17. Januarii*, tom. ii. p. 107.

(25) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii. P. ii. p. 48 &c.

imitated by many others, with so much success, that in a short time all the East swarmed with persons who, abandoning the occupations and conveniencies of life and all intercourse with society, pined away amidst various hardships, hunger and sufferings, in order to attain to a more close communion with God and the angels. The christian church would have remained free from these numerous tortures of the mind and body, had not that great and fascinating doctrine of the ancient philosophy gained credence among christians, that, to attain to happiness and communion with God, the soul must be freed from the influence of the body, and for this purpose, the body must be subdued.

§ 14. This austere discipline passed from the East into the West, and first into Italy and the adjacent islands, though it is uncertain who conveyed it thither.(26) Afterwards, *St. Martin*, the celebrated bishop of Tours, erected some monasteries in Gaul, and by his example and his discourses produced such eagerness to embrace a monastic life, that two thousand monks are said to have assembled together at his funeral.(27) From thence this way of life gradually extended over the other countries of Europe. Those however, who would acquaint themselves with these matters, should know, that there has always been a wide difference between the monks of the West and those of the East; and that the former could never be brought to bear the severe rules, to which the latter voluntarily submitted. For, our part of the world is not so filled with persons who are by nature sour, morose, delirious, and fanatical, as those oriental regions are; nor will our bodies endure that abstemiousness in regard to nourishment, which those will, which were born under a dry and burning atmosphere. It was therefore rather the name and the shadow of that solitary life which *Antony* and others instituted in the East, than the thing itself, which was brought into the countries of Europe.(28)

(26) The majority follow *Baronius*, maintaining that it was *St. Athanasius* who, about the year 340, transplanted the monastic institution from Egypt into Italy, and erected the first monastery at Rome. See *Mabillon*, *Praefatio ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* tom. i. p. ix. &c. But *Lud. Ant. Muratori* opposes this opinion, and contends that the first European monastery was built at Milan. *Antiq. Italicar. medii aevi*, tom. v. p. 364. Again, *Just. Fontinanus*, in his *Historia Litterar. Aquileiens.* p. 155 &c. maintains that the first society of monks was collected at Aquileia. None of these writers adduces unexceptionable proof. The first convent of nuns, was erected at Verona, near the close of this century, and by *Zeno* the bishop of Verona; if we may give credit to the brothers *Ballerini*, in their *Diss. ii. ad Zenonem Veronens.* p. 115 &c.

(27) See *Sulpitius Severus*, *de Vita Martini*, cap. x. p. 17. ed. Veron. where the mode of life adopted by these Martinian monks is particularly described. See also the *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tom. i. P. ii. p. 42. and others.

(28) This difference between the oriental and the occidental monks, as to their mode of living, and the cause of it, are pleasantly noticed by *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial. i. de Vita Martini*, c. 2. p. 65. ed. Verona. One of the interlocutors having described the dry and sparing diet of the Egyptian monks, *Sulpitius* turned

§ 15. These monks(29) were not all of the same kind; for first, they were divided into *Coenobites* and *Eremites*. The former lived and ate together in the same house, and were associated under a leader and head, whom they called *Father*, or in the Egyptian tongue, *Abbot*.(30) The latter, the *Eremites*, led a cheerless, solitary life, in certain parts of the country, dwelling in hovels among the wild beasts.(31) Still more austere than

to his Gallic friend, and said: "How would you like a bunch of herbs and half a loaf, as a dinner for five men? He, reddening a little on being so rallied, replied: You are at your old practice, *Sulpitius*, for you neglect no opportunity that occurs, to tax us [Gallic monks] with voracity. But it is cruel in you, to require us Gauls to live in the manner of angels.—But let that Cyrenian [monk] content himself with such a dinner, since it is his necessity or nature to go hungry.—We, as I have often told you, are Gauls." In the same dialogue, cap. 4. p. 69, 70, he taxes *Jerome* with accusing the monks of edacity, and goes on to say: "I perceive that he refers rather to the oriental monks, than to the occidental; for edacity in the Greeks [and orientals,] is gluttony; in the Gauls it is nature." Immediately therefore, on the introduction of the monastic institution into Europe, the occidental monks differed widely from the oriental in their customs and mode of living, and were taxed by them with voraciousness and gluttony.

(29) [The word *monk*, (μοναχός, from μονάζειν to live alone,) first occurs in the fourth century; and is kindred with *ascetic* [ἀσκητής, from ἀσκέω to practice, to exercise.] At least, the monks were also called *ascetics*; though all ascetics were not monks: for the name *ascetic* denotes a christian who devotes himself to severe religious exercises, and particularly, to abstinence and fasting. Such ascetics have always existed among christians; but these were not always monks. The word *ascetic* is a generic term; the word *monk* denotes a species under that genus. This is conceded by the Catholics, *Valesius* (notes on Euseb. Hist. Eccles. L. xi. c. 17. and de Martyr. Palaest. c. 11.) and by *Pagi*, Critica in Annal. Baronii, ad ann. 62. § 4. tom. i. p. 48.—The males among the monks were called *Nonni*, and the females *Nonnae*. See *Jerome*, Ep. 18. ad Eustoch. Opp. tom. iv. P. ii. p. 34. ed. Martianay. *Erasmus* derives the term *nonnus* from the Egyptian language: *Gerh. Jo. Vossius* derives it from the Hebrew נִינְיָ a son; de Vitiis Sermonis, L. i. c. 6. p. 9. L. ii. c. 13. de Orig. Idolol. L. i. c. 24. Schl.]

(30) [The *coenobites* derived their name from [κοινώβιον] *coenobium*, (κοινός βίος,) a habitation in which several monks lived together. The ancients discriminated between a *coenobium* and a *monastery*. The latter was the residence of proper and solitary monks; the former, of associated monks, who lived together in a society. The habitation of a single, solitary monk, might be called a *monastery*, but not a *coenobium*. See *Cassianus*, Collat. xviii. c. 10. Opp. p. 525. and compare *Jerome*, Ep. 95. ad Rusticum monachum; Opp. tom. iv. P. ii. p. 775. and *Gregory Naz.* Orat. xxi. Opp. tom. i. p. 384.—The nuns also had their presidents, who were called *Mothers*. See *Jerome*, Ep. 20. Opp. tom. iv. P. ii. p. 51. See also *Bingham*, Origines Ecclesiast. vol. iii. p. 63. Schl.]

(31) [From a passage in the beginning of the *Historia Lausiaca* of *Palladius*, it may be inferred, that in the most ancient times, the *eremites* and the *anchorites* were the same; for he speaks of the ἀναχωρησῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

But subsequently, a distinction was made between them. Schl.—The terms *monks*, *eremites* and *anchorites* or *anachorites*, were at first, all used as synonymous; and were applied indiscriminately to those Egyptian *ascetics*, who ἀναχώρησαν retired from the world, and lived solitary μοναχοὶ (from μόνος alone) in the wilderness ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, for the sake of practising (ἀσχεῖν) their religious exercises without interruption. The words *ascetic* and *monk* continued to be generic; and were applied to all, who devoted themselves to a religious life, and subjected themselves to strict rules of living. The other terms acquired more appropriate significations, when the monks became distributed into various classes or sorts. Tr.]

the Eremites, were those who were called *Anchorites*. These lived in desert places, with no kind of shelter; fed on roots and plants; and had no fixed residence, but lodged wherever night overtook them, so that visitors might not know where to find them.(32) The last class of monks were the *Vagrants*, called by the Egyptians *Sarabaitae*, who roamed about the provinces, and from city to city, and got their living without labor, by pretended miracles, by trafficking in relics, and by other impositions.(33) Among the *Coenobites*, many were vicious and profligate; but not so many as among the *Sarabaites*, most of whom were knaves and villains. Of the *Eremites*, the greater part were delirious fanatics, who were not in their right mind.(34) All these monks were hitherto *laymen*, or separate from the clerical order, and under the care and protection of the bishops. But many of them were now admitted into the rank of *clergymen*, even by the command of the emperors; and so great was their reputation for sanctity, that bishops were often chosen from among them.(35)

§ 16. To these defects in the moral system of the age, must be added two principal errors now almost publicly adopted, and from which afterwards immense evils resulted. The first was, that to *deceive and lie, is a virtue*, when religion can be promoted by it. The other was, that *errors in religion*, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, ought to be visited with *penalties and punishments*. The first of these principles had been embraced in the preceding centuries; and it is almost incredible, what a mass of the most insipid fables, and what a host of pious falsehoods have, through all the centuries, grown out of it, to the great detriment of true religion. If some inquisitive person were to examine the conduct and the writings of the greatest and most pious teachers of this century, I fear, he would find about all of them infected with this leprosy. I cannot except *Ambrose*, nor *Hilary*, nor *Augustine*, nor *Gregory Naz.* nor *Jerome*. And perhaps it was this same fault, that led *Sulpitius Severus*, who was in other respects no incompetent historian, to

(32) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, c. ix. p. 80 &c. ed. Verona. [When several *anchorites* lived in the same wilderness, only a little separated from each other, they were collectively called a *Laura*. See *Evagrius*, Historia Eccles. L. i. c. 21. and *Valesius*, note on this passage. See also *Walch's Hist. Eccles. N. T.* p. 1670. *Schl.*]

(33) [Concerning the *Sarabaites*, see *Jo. Cassianus*, Collat. xviii. c. 7. Opp. p. 731 &c. and the notes of *Gazaenus*, there. *Tr.*]

(34) On the vices of the monks of this century, see *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, cap. iv. p. 99, 70. cap. xiv. p. 88. where he chastises in particular, the pride of those who coveted the honors of clergymen. Dial. ii. c. viii. p. 112. Dial. iii. c. xv. p. 144, 145. also the *Consultatio Apollonii et Zachaei*, published by *Lu. Dachery*, in *Spicileg.* tom. i. L. iii. c. 3. p. 35 &c.

(35) See *Ja. Godefroi*, on the *Codex Theodos.* Tom vi. P. i. p. 76, 106. ed. Ritter.

ascribe so many miracles to *St. Martin*. The other principle, from the very time when *Constantine* gave peace and security to the christians, was approved by many: in the conflicts with the Priscillianists and Donatists, it was corroborated by examples, and unequivocally sanctioned by the authority of *Augustine*, and transmitted down to succeeding ages.

§ 17. If we look at the lives and morals of christians, we shall find, as heretofore, that good men were commingled with bad; yet the number of the bad began gradually to increase, so that the truly pious and godly appeared more rare. When there was no more to fear, from enemies without; when the character of most bishops was tarnished with arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, resentments, and other defects; when the lower clergy neglected their proper duties, and were more attentive to idle controversies, than to the promotion of piety and the instruction of the people; when vast numbers were induced, not by a rational conviction, but by the fear of punishment, and the hope of worldly advantage, to enrol themselves as christians; how can it surprise us, that on all sides, the vicious appeared a host, and the pious, a little band almost overpowered by them? Against the flagitious, and those guilty of heinous offences, the same rules for penance were prescribed, as before the reign of *Constantine*. But as the times continually waxed worse, the more honorable and powerful could sin with impunity, and only the poor and the unfortunate felt the severity of the laws.

§ 18. This century was fruitful in controversies among christians; for, as is common with mankind, external peace made room for internal discords and contentions. We shall here mention the more considerable ones, which did not give rise to obstinate heresies. In Egypt, soon after the century began, or about the year 306, commenced the long continued schism, which from the author of it, was called the *Meletian* controversy. *Peter*, the bishop of Alexandria, deposed *Meletius* the bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais. The cause is involved in uncertainty. The friends of *Peter* represent *Meletius* as one who had sacrificed to the gods, and had committed other crimes.(36) Others say, he was guilty of no offence, but that of excessive severity against the lapsed.(37) *Meletius* disregarded the sentence of *Peter*, and not only continued to exercise the functions of his office, but assumed to himself the power of consecrating presbyters; a right which, according to established usage in Egypt, belonged exclusively to the bishop of Alexandria. The partisans of this serious and eloquent man were numerous; and at length not a few of the

(36) *Athanasius*, *Apologia secunda*; Opp. Tom. i. p. 777 &c.

(37) *Epiphanius*, *Haeres. lxxviii.* Opp. Tom. i. p. 716 &c. See *Dion. Petavius*, note on *Epiphan.* Tom. ii. p. 274: and *Sam. Basnage*, *Exercitatio de rebus sacris contra Baronium*, p. 305 &c.

monks espoused his cause. The Nicene council attempted in vain to heal this breach.(38) The *Meletians*, on the contrary, whose chief aim was to oppose the authority claimed by the bishop of Alexandria, afterwards joined themselves to his great enemies, namely the Arians.(39) Thus a contest which at first related only to the limits of the Alexandrine bishop's powers, became, through the influence of heated passions, a controversy respecting an article of faith. The Meletian party was still existing in the fifth century.(40)

(38) [The attempt of this council is worthy of particular attention, because from it may be drawn a conclusion which is in opposition to the statement of *Athanasius*. If *Meletius* had really sacrificed to idols, as *Athanasius* represents, the council would not have treated him so mildly as they actually did. *Socrates* (Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 9.) has preserved the epistle of the fathers assembled at Nice, which they addressed to the church of Alexandria and the Egyptian Christians. In this epistle they say, they had decreed that *Meletius* should remain in his city, but should have no power either to perform ordination or to appoint teachers, nor should he appear either in the country or in any town for such an object; but still, that he should retain the title of bishop. The sixth canon of this council refers also to this subject. "The existing laws in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, shall hereafter be observed; that the bishop of Alexandria shall have the oversight of all these—and if any one shall be made a bishop, without the previous consent of the metropolitan, he shall not hold the office." See *Mansi*, Collectio ampliss. Concilior. Tom. ii. p. 670: and the younger *Walch's* Ketzerhistorie, vol. iv. p. 385 &c. Schl.]

(39) [See the younger *Walch's* Ketzerhistorie, vol. iv. p. 393 &c. Schl.]

(40) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 6. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 8.—[On the history of this controversy, it is proper to remark, in general, that some reject altogether the account which is given of it by *Epiphanius* regarding the account of *Athanasius* as more worthy of credit. This is the prevailing opinion in the Roman Catholic church. Others consider the account of *Epiphanius*, as most worthy to be received, for the following reasons. (1) *Epiphanius* was prepossessed in favor of neither party. He speaks respectfully of the bishops opposed to *Meletius*, and he censures the Meletians with caution. (2) On the contrary, *Athanasius* was a strenuous foe to the Meletians, and every where shews his bitter hatred of them. (3) Yet he mentions the crime of *Meletius* but once, and then very concisely. The subsequent writers, who were more free from the heat of passion, do not follow him exactly. Only *Sozomen* coincides with him. *Theodoret* omits the circumstance of *Meletius's* fall. *Sozomen*, is wholly silent about it. Yet it is not probable that these writers, who were by no means partial to the Meletians, would have so deviated from *Athanasius*, if they had held his statement to be uncontrovertible. (4) *Epiphanius* is not inclined to say favorable things of other sectarians, without good reason; and the evil which *Athanasius* had said of *Meletius*, could not probably have been unknown to him. (5) The statement of *Epiphanius* has too much self-consistency for a fabrication. (6) What *Epiphanius* states of the views of bishop *Peter* in regard to admitting the lapsed to communion, agrees with the 14th and 15th canons of this bishop; on which, see *Fabrics*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 411. and *Tillemont*, Tome v. p. 450 &c. (7) It is incomprehensible, that the Nicene fathers should have treated *Meletius* so indulgently, if they regarded the accusation of *Athanasius* as well founded. (8) As the Meletians were so strict in their intercourse with the lapsed, it is inconceivable that they could receive for their leader, any person who had been guilty of a fall of the grossest kind.—There are others who are undecided, and not established in their judgment. *Sam. Basnage*, in his Exercitat. Antibar. referred to above in note (36,) declares the accusation of *Athanasius* in regard to the idolatrous sacrifice, to be false; and in his Annales politico-ecclesiast. Tom. ii. p. 608 &c. he rejects the account of *Epiphanius*. Dr. *Baumgarten*, in his Auszug der Kirchengesch. vol. ii. p. 681. gives the preference to the statement of *Athanasius*; but in his Geschichte der Religionspartheyen, p. 506,

§ 19. Not long after Meletius, one *Eustathius* excited great commotions in Armenia, Pontus, and the neighboring countries ;

he follows *Epiphanius* exclusively. Even *Mosheim*, in the first edition of his *Institutes of Christian Church History*, p. 253, says : “ Notwithstanding the objections of *Petavius*, perhaps the statement of *Epiphanius* is the most correct.” But in the new edition, this remark is omitted. Also in his lectures, during his last years, he expressed himself dubiously, without declaring for either party.—The most full and soundly critical examination of the Meletian controversy, is that of *Dr. Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 355—410. He also remarks, from *Tillemont*, vol. v. p. 455, that likewise, one *Meletius of Syria* caused a schism, which in its consequences was more important than the preceding ; and that *Erasmus* and *Prateolus* confound the two schisms. After the council of Nice, *Eustathius*, bishop of Antioch, very strenuously opposed the progress of Arian doctrines, and was therefore deprived of his office ; and another was elected in his place who was more favorable to the Arians ; and after him succeeded others, all holding Arian sentiments. The last of these was *Eudoxius*, who was removed to Constantinople, on the deposition of *Macedonius*, bp. of that city, (AD. 360.) *Meletius* of Syria, was now chosen bishop of Antioch by a council. He had before been bishop of Sebaste, and the heads of the Arian party supposed him to hold the Arian sentiments. He at least held communion with Arians, and had by his virtuous life obtained a high reputation. At first *Meletius* concealed his sentiments, and in his public discourses treated only on practical subjects. But as one part of his hearers were orthodox, and the other part Arians, he did not long leave them in uncertainty, but acknowledged to them his conviction of the correctness of the Nicene faith. This acknowledgement was the source of much suffering to *Meletius*. The Arians resented it very highly, that he should disappoint their expectations ; and as he would not retract, they deprived him of his office, AD. 362, by the aid of the emperor *Constantius*, and banished him from the country. *Meletius* now left Antioch and went to his native city Melitene. In his place, *Euzoius* one of the oldest friends of Arius, was appointed. But the orthodox, who would not acknowledge him as a bishop, now wholly ceased to worship with the Arians, which they had done up to this time. Thus there were now three parties at Antioch. The *Arians* who acknowledged *Euzoius* for their bishop ; the *Eustathians*, who ever since the deposition of *Eustathius*, (AD. 327,) whom they regarded as the legitimate bishop of Antioch, had ceased to worship with the Arians, and held their separate meetings without making disturbance ; and the *Meletians*, who were the majority, and who acknowledged *Meletius* for the legitimate bishop. The *Meletians* were willing to unite with the *Eustathians*, on condition that they would look upon *Meletius* as themselves did. But the *Eustathians* refused to do so, and would not acknowledge the *Meletians* for brethren, because they considered both them and their bishop as not pure enough from the Arian infection. *Athanasius*, *Eusebius* of Vercelli and *Lucifer* attempted to reconcile these divisions. *Lucifer* (AD. 362) consecrated a new bishop of Antioch ; whom however the *Eustathians* only would receive. *Meletius* now came back to Antioch ; and thus there were two bishops of Antioch, *Paulinus*! (the *Eustathian* bishop,) and *Meletius* ; and the difficulties were increased, rather than settled, by the procedure of *Lucifer*. The foreign bishops took part in this controversy. *Athanasius* looked on *Paulinus* as the most orthodox, and therefore he and the greater part of the West took the side of *Paulinus*. The eastern bishops were on the side of *Meletius* ; who was exiled by the emperor *Valens*, but returned after that emperor's death, and suddenly died (AD. 381.) The Greek and the Latin churches enrolled him among the saints, after his death. As respects the Latin church, this was a very extraordinary transaction. *Meletius* died entirely out of communion with the Romish see ; and yet he is numbered among their saints ! Either the pope then must be not infallible, or the Romish church worships as saints, persons who, according to her own principles, are unworthy of worship. The death of *Meletius* did not restore peace at Antioch. The *Meletians*, instead of acknowledging *Paulinus* for a legitimate bishop, elected *Flavianus*, an orthodox and irreproachable character, for a successor to *Meletius*. This *Flavianus* was supported by the bishops of Syria, Palestine, Phenicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, the lesser Asia, and Thrace ; on the side of *Paulinus* were the bishops of Rome and Italy, and

and was therefore condemned in the council of *Gangra*, which was held not long after the Nicene council. Whether this man was *Eustathius* the bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, or whether the ancients confounded two persons of the same name, is debated with about equal weight of argument on both sides.(40) The founder of the Eustathian sect is charged, not so much with unsoundness in the faith, as with unreasonable practical notions. For he is said to have prohibited marriage, eating flesh, love-feasts, &c. and to have recommended immediate divorce to all married persons, and to have granted to children and servants the liberty of violating the commands of their parents and masters, under pretext of religion.(41)

§ 20. *Lucifer*, bishop of *Cagliari* in Sardinia, a man of decision, sternness, and vigor, who was driven into exile by the em-

of Egypt and Arabia, who wished for the deposition of *Flavianus*. *Paulinus* died (in 389 ;) but instead of giving peace to the church, influenced probably by a fanatical obstinacy, he consecrated over his little party, before his death, one *Evagrius* as his successor. Soon after, (AD. 393,) *Evagrius* died : but the disunion still continued. Finally, through the prudence and the peace-making temper of *Chrysostom*, peace and ecclesiastical communion between the two parties were restored. *Flavianus* was acknowledged by the foreign bishops as the bishop of Antioch. Yet there remained a little handful of *Eustathians*, who did not unite with the general church till *Flavianus* was succeeded by other bishops. See *Walch*, *Ketzerhistorie*, vol. iv. p. 410—502. *Schl.*]

(40) See *Sam. Basnage*, *Annals Politico-Ecclesiast.* Tom. ii. p. 840 &c.

(41) *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. ii. c. 43 *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. iii. c. 14. L. ii. c. 24. *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxvi. p. 910. *Philostorgius*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. iii. c. 16. *Wolfg. Gundling*, *Notae ad Concilium Gangrense*, p. 9 &c.—[The younger *Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 536—577, has treated circumstantially and solidly, concerning the Eustathians. See also his *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 216 &c. The chief sources for a history of the Eustathians, are the documents of the council of *Gangra*, consisting of a synodical epistle, and 20 canons. From these sources both *Socrates* and *Sozomen* derived their information. The author of the *Life of St. Basil*, which is prefixed to the third vol. of the works of *Basil*, maintains, (ch. 5. § 4 &c.) that the founder of this party was not *Eustathius*, but rather *Aerius* ; and also that, the persons with whom the council of *Gangra* had to do, should not be called *Eustathians*, but *Aerians*. But his arguments are not so powerful as to compel a reflecting reader to abandon the common opinion. Whether the bishop of *Sebaste* in Armenia, who is so famous in the history of the Arian heresy, and who had some connexion with *Aerius*, or another *Eustathius*, was the origin of this controversy, cannot be determined with certainty. Yet the arguments for the first supposition seem to preponderate. This *Eustathius* was a pupil of *Aerius*, and a lover of monkery. Many different councils passed their judgment on him, some putting him down, and others regarding him as a valuable man. He has been accused of instability in his belief ; but he seems properly to have been a semi-Arian. His character is described to us by some impartial writers, as being very commendable. The synodical epistle of the council of *Gangra* is addressed to the bishops of Armenia, and censures various faults, which for the most part relate to monkish usages : and the canons enjoin the opposite of the new regulations. The *Eustathians* condemned matrimony, because they maintained that a married lady, though pious, could not be saved, if she continued to cohabit with her husband. They forbid eating flesh, or receiving the holy supper from a married priest, on pain of forfeiting salvation. They contemned the buildings erected for public worship, and held their meetings in private. They allowed a woman to forsake her husband, parents their children, and children their parents, on pretence of devoting themselves to a stricter mode of life, &c. *Schl.*]

peror *Constantine*, for defending the Nicene doctrine of three persons in one God, first separated from *Eusebius* of Vercelli, in the year 363, because the latter was displeased that the former had consecrated *Paulinus* bishop of the church of Antioch; and afterwards separated himself from the communion of the whole church, because it had decreed that absolution might be granted to those bishops, who under *Constantius* had deserted to the Arians.(42) At least this is certain, that the little company of his followers, or the *Luciferians*, would have no intercourse with the bishops who joined themselves to the Arian sect, nor with those who had absolved these bishops after confessing their fault; and thus they renounced the whole church.(43) They are likewise reported to have held erroneous sentiments respecting the human soul, viewing it as generated from the bodies of the parents, or as transfused by the parents into their children.(44)

§ 21. About the same time, or not much after, *Aerius*, a presbyter, monk, and semi-Arian, rent Armenia, Pontus and Cappadocia, by opinions wide of those commonly received, and thus founded a sect. First, he maintained that, (*jure divino*,) by divine appointment, there was no difference between bishops and presbyters. Yet it is not very clear, how far he carried this

(42) *Rufinus*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. c. 30. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 9. See also *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, Tome vii. p. 521. ed. Paris:—[and, above all others, *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 338—377. From him, we shall enlarge the account given by Dr. *Mosheim*. When the orthodox party under *Constantius*, after the adverse result to them of the council of Arles, found themselves in great danger, and were deliberating about requesting the emperor to summon a new council; *Lucifer* proceeded to Rome, and being constituted envoy of the Romish bishop *Liberius*, he thence repaired to the imperial court in Gaul, and obtained of the emperor the council of Milan; by which however the emperor intended to further his own purposes. And as *Lucifer* was one of those who in that council zealously espoused the cause of the orthodox, he fell under the emperor's displeasure, and was sent among others into banishment. When the death of the emperor left him at liberty to return from exile, he became involved in the Meletian controversy at Antioch, and this occasioned his falling out with *Eusebius* bishop of Vercelli. For he led on and consecrated the aged *Paulinus* bishop, which *Eusebius* greatly disapproved; because, according to the decrees of the council held at Alexandria by *Athanasius*, he with *Lucifer* were commissioned to heal the division at Antioch, which was now widened still more by the unwise step of *Lucifer*. The same council had also decreed, that the Arian bishops, and still more those who had held communion with such bishops, after acceding to the Nicene creed, might be received into the church and remain in their offices. But the refusal of *Eusebius* to approve of the proceedings of *Lucifer* at Antioch, and the mild regulations of the Alexandrian council respecting those he accounted apostate bishops, which he could by no means approve, induced him to break off all church communion with such as approved those regulations: and thence arose the schism which bears his name. After this separation, he continued to exercise his functions at Cagliari for nine years, and at last died at an advanced age. *Schl.*—See, for account of his writings, Note, p. 309. Tr.]

(43) See the petition addressed to Theodosius, by *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, two Luciferians; in the Works of *Is. Sirmond*, Tom. ii. p. 229 &c.

(44) See *Augustine*, de Haeres. c. 81; and on that passage, *Lamb. Danaeus*, p. 346. [This account is very uncertain; and *Augustine* himself does not state it as a matter of certainty. See *Walch*, l. c. p. 368. *Schl.*]

sentiment ; though it is certain, that it was very pleasing to many, who were disgusted with the pride and arrogance of the bishops of that age. In the next place, *Aerius* disapproved of prayers for the dead, the stated fasts, the celebration of Easter, and other things, which most persons regarded as the very soul of religion.(45) He seems to have aimed, to reduce religion to its primitive simplicity : a design, which in itself considered, was laudable ; though in the motives and the mode of proceeding, there were perhaps some things censurable.

§ 22. There were other persons of this character in the fourth century, who looked with disgust on the progress of superstition and of errors respecting the true nature of religion, and who opposed the general current ; but received as the only reward of their labor, to be branded with infamy. Eminent among them was *Jovinian*, an Italian monk, who taught first at Rome, and then at Milan, near the close of the century, and persuaded many, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they make to Christ in baptism, and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven ; so that those who spent their lives in celiba-

(45) *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxxv. p. 905 &c. *Augustine*, *de Haeres.* c. 53. and some others. [The last is not a witness of much weight. He had no acquaintance with the *Aerians*, but took one part of his statement from *Epiphanius*, (*ubi supra*), and the other from *Philastrius*, *de Haeres.* c. 72. p. 140. *Epiphanius* had it in his power to get, and did get, better information respecting the oriental controversies, than *Philastrius* could. The latter speaks of *Aerius*, as of one unknown to him ; the former, as one whose history he well knew, and who was then alive. *Epiphanius* knew the *Encratites* very well, and he distinguishes them from the *Aerians* ; but *Epiphanius* confounds them. *Aerius* was a native of *Pontus*, or of the lesser *Armenia*, an eloquent man, and a friend of the well known semi-Arian *Eustathius*, afterwards bishop of *Sebaste*, with whom he lived at the same time among the monks. The elevation of *Eustathius* to the see of *Sebaste*, first awakened envy in *Aerius*, he having himself aspired after that promotion. To allay that feeling, *Eustathius* made his friend a presbyter, and committed to his care the superintendence of a house for the reception of strangers. But the good understanding between them was of short continuance. *Aerius* could be restrained by nothing from his restless conduct towards his bishop, whom he accused of avarice and misappropriation of the funds for the poor. At last, they came to a breach. *Aerius* abandoned his office and his hospital, and acquired many adherents, to whom none would show indulgence, as the disposition to persecute was then almost universal among the clergy. *Aerius* maintained, that in the times of the apostles, there was no difference between a bishop and a presbyter ; and this he solidly proved from passages in Paul. He was not disposed to abolish the human rights of bishops, but only to rescue the presbyters from episcopal oppression, in the exercise of their legitimate functions. He held the prayers and the alms of the living for the dead, to be useless and dangerous ; and discarded the regular, prescribed, christian fasts on certain days. The festival of Easter, he did not wholly discard, as it is commonly supposed, but only the ceremony of slaying a lamb at Easter, which according to ancient custom was practiced by some christians. This appears from the argument, by which he supported his opinion. For he says : "Christians should keep no *Passover*, because Paul declares *Christ*, who was slain for us, to be *our Paschal Lamb*." This reasoning would be insipid, if *Aerius* proposed by it to put down altogether the whole festival of Easter. *Aerius* was therefore in the right, and his opposers in the wrong. Only his obstinacy in pushing matters to a schism, is blameable. See the younger *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 321—338. *Schl.*]

cy, or macerated their bodies by fasting, were no more acceptable to God, than those who lived in wedlock, and nourished their bodies with moderation and sobriety. These sentiments were first condemned by the church of Rome, and then by *Ambrose*, in a council held at Milan in the year 390.(46) The emperor *Honorius* enacted penal laws against those holding such sentiments, and *Jovinian* he banished to the island Boa.(47) *Jovinian* published his opinions in a book, against which *Jerome*, in the following century, wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, which is still extant.

§ 23. Of all the religious controversies [among the orthodox], those concerning *Origen* made the greatest noise and continued the longest. Though *Origen* had long been accused of many errors, yet hitherto most christians had regarded his name with veneration. But now the Arians cunningly looking on every side for support, maintained that this great man had been of their party. Some believed them, and therefore indulged the same hatred towards *Origen*, as towards the Arians. Yet some of the most eminent and best informed men resisted the charge, and strove to vindicate the reputation of their master against these aspersions. Among these *Eusebius*, bishop of Cesarea, stood preeminent, in consequence of his written *Apology for Origen*. And, I believe, this storm raised against the honor of a man, to whom the whole christian world paid respect, would have soon subsided, if new commotions had not arisen, which proceeded from another source.

§ 24. All the monks, and especially those of Egypt, were enthusiastic admirers of *Origen*; and they spared no pains to disseminate every where the opinions which they imbibed from him.

(46) *Hieronymus*, in *Jovinianum*, Opp. tom. ii. *Augustine*, de *Haeres.* c. 82. *Ambrose*, Ep. vi. &c. [*Jovinian* lived at Rome, when he advanced the doctrines which were so strenuously opposed. Yet it is uncertain, whether Rome, or Milan, was his native place. He was not unlearned, and he lived a single life. To the preceding doctrines of *Jovinian*, the following may be added. That *Mary* ceased to be a virgin, by bringing forth *Christ*; which some denied:—that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works;—and that a truly converted christian, so long as he is such, can not sin wilfully, but will so resist the temptations of the devil, as not to be overcome by him. For these doctrines, *Jovinian* was accused by some christians at Rome, before *Siricius* the Roman bishop. A council was assembled by *Siricius*, by which *Jovinian* was condemned and excommunicated. He then retired, with his friends, to Milan. There they were condemned, by a council which *Ambrose* assembled. By such persecution, the party was soon crushed. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 635—682. *Schl.*]

(47) *Codex Theodosianus*, Tom. iii. p. 218. Tom. vi. p. 193.—[This law is dated in the year 412. But according to the representation of *Jerome*, *Jovinian* must, in the year 406, have been dead some considerable time. The law therefore must have been aimed against altogether a different person—and there appear in it no traces of the complaints brought against *Jovinian*—or the date of it must be erroneous, as was conjectured by *Tillemont*, Tome x. p. 229, 753. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 664 &c. *Schl.*]

Yet they could not persuade all to believe, that those opinions were sound and correct. Hence arose, at first, a concealed disagreement as to the reasonableness of the doctrines of *Origen*, which gradually increased till it burst into an open flame. Among many others, *John*, bishop of Jerusalem, was in favor of *Origen*; and as *Epiphanius* and *Jerome* were, from other causes, hostile to *John*, they endeavored to excite odium against him on this ground. He defended himself in such a way as, at the same time, to protect the reputation of *Origen*; and thus he had the whole swarm of monks and innumerable others on his side. From this beginning, followed those vehement contests respecting the doctrines of *Origen*, which pervaded both the East and the West. In the West, they were fomented especially by *Rufinus*, a presbyter of Aquileia, who translated some of *Origen's* books into Latin, and showed not obscurely, that he was pleased with the sentiments those books contained.(48) He therefore now incurred the implacable wrath of *Jerome*. But at length, *Rufinus* being dead, and men of high reputation in the West opposing the progress of Origenism, both by their influence and their writings, these commotions seemed to subside in the West.

§ 25. In the East, far greater troubles came upon the church on account of Origenism. *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, who was for various reasons hostile to some of the monks of Scetys and Nitria, taxed them with their Origenism, and ordered them to throw away the books of *Origen*. The monks resisted his command; alleging, sometimes, that the objectionable passages in the writings of that holy man, were interpolations of the heretics, and sometimes, that it was improper to condemn the whole together, on account of a few passages which might be justly censurable. *Theophilus* therefore, having assembled a council at Alexandria in the year 399, which condemned the Origenists, with an armed force drove the monks from the mountain of Nitria. They fled first to Jerusalem, and thence removed to Scythopolis; but finding themselves insecure there likewise, they set sail for Constantinople, intending to lay their cause before the imperial court.(49) The remainder of their history belongs to the next century. But it is proper to remark, that those who are denominated *Origenists* in the writings of this age, were not all of one character. For this ambiguous term sometimes

(48) See especially, *Just. Fontaninus*, *Historia litteraria Aquileiens.* Lib. iv. c. 3 &c. p. 177 &c. where he gives an elaborate history of *Rufinus*.

(49) See *Peter Dan. Huet*, *Origeniana*, Lib. ii. cap. 4. p. 196 &c. *Ludov. Doucin*, *Histoire de l'Origenisme*, Liv. iii. p. 95 &c. *Hieron. a Prato*, *Diss. vi.* in *Sulpitium Severum de Monachis ob Originis nomen ex Nitria totaque Aegypto pulsus*, p. 273. Veron. 1741. Fol. These writers cite the ancient authorities; but they make some mistakes. [The literary history of this controversy is given by the senior *Walch*, *Historia Eccles.* N. T. p. 1042 &c. *Schl.*]

denotes merely a person who was friendly to *Origen*, who looked upon his books as corrupted, and did not defend the errors of which he was accused : but at other times, it designates those persons, who admitted that *Origen* taught all that he was charged with teaching, and who resolutely defended his opinions. Of this latter class were many of the monks.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1, 2. Ceremonies multiplied.—§ 3. Form of public worship.—§ 4. Some parts of it changed.—§ 5. Festal days.—§ 6. Fasts.—§ 7. Administration of baptism—§ 8. and of the Lord's supper.

§ 1. While the good will of the emperors aimed to advance the christian religion, the indiscreet piety of the bishops obscured its true nature and oppressed its energies, by the multiplication of rites and ceremonies. The observation of *Augustine* is well known, That the yoke once laid upon the Jews, was more supportable than that laid on many christians in his age.(1) For the christian bishops introduced, with but slight alterations, into the christian worship, those rites and institutions by which, formerly, the Greeks and Romans and others had manifested their piety and reverence towards their imaginary deities; supposing that the people would more readily embrace christianity, if they perceived the rites handed down to them from their fathers, still existing unchanged among the christians, and saw, that *Christ* and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner, as formerly their gods were. There was, of course, little difference in these times between the public worship of the christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both there were splendid robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, crosiers,(2) processions, lustrations, images, golden and silver vases, and innumerable other things alike.

§ 2. No sooner had *Constantine*, renounced the religion of his ancestors, than magnificent temples were every where erected, which were adorned with pictures and images, and which both in their external and their internal form, were very similar to the fanes and the temples of the gods.(3) These temples

(1) *Augustine*, Epist. 119. ad Januarium, according to the ancient division.

(2) [The *crosier* or *bishop's staff*, was exactly of the form of the *litrus*, the chief ensign of the ancient *Augurs*. See *Cicero*, de Divinatione, L. i. c. 17. Tr.]

(3) See *Ezek. Spanheim*, Preuves sur les Césars de Julien, p. 47; but especially, *Peter le Brun*, Explication littérale et histor. des ceremonies de la Messe, Tome ii. p. 101 &c For a description of such a temple, see *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini Magni, L. iii. c. 35 &c. Plates representing the interior form, are given by *Wm. Beveridge*, Adnotatt. ad Pandectas Canonum, Tom. ii. p. 70. and by *Fred. Spanheim*, Institutt. Hist. Eccles. in his Opp. Tom. i. p. 860. Some parts of the christian temples, were after the pattern of the Jewish temple. See *Camp. Vitringa*, de Synagoga veteri, Lib. iii. p. 466. [Some of these temples were new buildings erected by the emperors; others were pagan temples transmuted to christian churches. See *Codex Theodos.* Lib. ix. Tit. xvii. legem 2.

were of two kinds. Some were erected at the graves of the *martyrs*, and were called *Martyria*: the people assembled in these only at stated times. Others were intended for the ordinary and common meetings for religious worship; and were afterwards called by the Latins *Tituli*.(4) Both were consecrated with great pomp, and with rites borrowed in great measure from the ancient laws of the Roman pontiffs. And, what is more strange, a great part of religion was supposed to consist in a multitude of churches; and the *right of patronage*, as it is called, was introduced among christians, for no other reason than to induce opulent persons to build churches.(5) Thus in this particular, the true religion evidently copied after superstition. For the ancient nations supposed that a country or province would be the more prosperous and secure, the more temples, fanes and chapels were there erected to the gods and heroes; because those gods would be ashamed not to show themselves patrons and defenders of those who worshipped and honored them with so much zeal. The same sentiment prevailed among the christians. They supposed, the more temples there were dedicated to *Christ*, to his servants and friends, the more certain they might be of assistance from *Christ* and his friends. For they supposed God, *Christ*, and the inhabitants of heaven, equally with us wretched mortals, to be delighted and captivated with external signs and expressions of respect.

§ 3. The christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, reading the holy scriptures, a discourse to the people, and finally, the celebration of the Lord's supper. But these exercises were accompanied with various ceremonies, better calculated to please the eye, than to excite true devotion.(6) But all congregations did not, by any means, follow one and the same rule or form. Each individual bishop according to his own views, and as the cir-

and *Jerome*, Chronicon, Ann. 332. From the Jews was borrowed, the division into the holy of holies, the holy place, and the court; from which came the Chancel, the Nave, and the Porch. *βῆμα, ναὸς, and νᾶρθηξ. Schl.*

(4) *Joh. Mabillon*, Museum Italic. tom. ii. in Comment. ad ordin. Roman. p. xvi &c. [The *Tituli*, of the middle ages, were properly the *parish churches*, under the care of presbyters, who derived their titles from their respective churches. See *du Cange*, glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis, voce, *Titulus. Tr.*]

(5) *Just. Henn. Boehmer*, Jus Eccles. Protestant. Tom. iii. p. 466 &c. *Bibliothèque Italique*, Tome v. p. 166 &c. [Whoever erected to any god either a larger or a smaller temple, had the right of designating the priests and attendants on the altar who should officiate there. And whoever erected a christian temple, possessed the same right in regard to those who should minister there. This induced many persons to build churches. *Schl.*]

(6) The form of public worship, or the *liturgy* of this age, may be very well learned in general from *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* xxii; and from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which are falsely ascribed to *Clemens Roman.* These writers are carefully explained and interpreted by *Peter le Brun*, Explication litterale et historique de la Messe, tom. ii. p. 53 &c. which is a very learned work. [See also *Dr. Ernesti's Antimurator*. p. 13 &c. *Schl.*]

cumstances of times, places, and persons suggested, prescribed to his own flock such a form of public worship, as he indeed best. Hence that variety of *liturgies* which were in use, before the Roman pontiff arrogated to himself supreme power in religious matters, and persuaded people that they ought to copy after the principal church, the common mother of them all, as well in doctrine as in their modes of worship.

§ 4. It would carry me too far, if I should run over all the parts of public worship: I will therefore content myself with a few observations. Among the public hymns, the Psalms which David composed were now received.(7) The public discourses, among the Greeks especially, were formed according to the rules for civil eloquence; and were better adapted to call forth the admiration of the rude multitude, who love display, than to amend the heart. And that no folly and no senseless custom might be omitted in their public assemblies, the people were allowed to applaud their orators, as had been practised in the forum and in the theatres; nay were instructed both to applaud and to clap the preachers.(8) Who would suppose, that men professing to despise vain glory, and who were appointed to show to others the emptiness of all human things, would become so senseless?

§ 5. The *first day of the week*, on which christians were accustomed to meet for the worship of God, *Constantine* required by a special law, to be observed more sacredly than before.(9) In most congregations of christians, five annual festivals were observed; namely in remembrance of the Savior's *birth*, of his sufferings and *death* for the sins of men, of his *resurrection*, of his *ascension* to heaven, and of the *descent of the Holy Ghost* upon his ministers. Of these festivals, that of the fourteen days sacred to the memory of *Christ's* return to life, was observed with much

(7) *Beausobre*, Histoire du Manicheisme, tom. ii. p. 614 &c. [They were sung in course, or in their order. *Joh. Cassianus*, Institut. L. ii. c. 2. 4. Lib. iii. c. 3. Yet for the public worship on certain occasions, particular Psalms were appointed; (*Augustine*, on Ps. xxi.) and it lay with the bishop to designate what Psalms he would have sung. *Athanasius*, Apolog. ii. *Augustine* on Ps. cxxxviii. Schl.]

(8) *Fran. Bernh. Ferrarius*, de veterum acclamationibus et plausu, p. 66.

(9) *Ja. Godefrói*, Notes to the *Codex Theodos.* tom. i. p. 135. [See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, Lib. iv. c. 18, 19, 20, 23. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 8. The principal laws of *Constantine* and his successors, in regard to the Lord's day and the other festivals, are collected in the *Codex Justinianus*, Lib. iii. Tit. xii. Leg. 1—11. The Lord's day and the other festivals were placed on the same level. On them all, the courts of Justice and the public offices were to be closed, except in certain urgent cases. *Constantine* in the year 321, required the inhabitants of cities and all mechanics to suspend their business on the Lord's day; but he allowed such as resided in the country full liberty to pursue their agriculture; because it was supposed necessary for them, to sow their fields and prop their vines, when the weather and the season best suited. The emperor *Leo*, however, in the year 469, thought agriculture required no exception; and therefore he included farmers under the same prohibition with mechanics. See *Imp. Leonis Novellae*, Constitut. 54. Tr.]

more ceremony than the rest.(10) The oriental christians kept the memorial of the Savior's *birth* and of his *baptism*, on one and the same day, namely the *sixth* day of January; and this day they called *Epiphany*.(11) But the occidental christians always consecrated the 25th day of December to the memory of the Savior's birth. For, what is reported of *Julian I.* the Roman bishop's transferring the memorial of Christ's birth from the 6th of January to the 25th of December,(12) appears to me very questionable. The unlucky success of the age in finding the dead bodies of certain holy men, increased immensely the celebration of *memorials of the martyrs*. Devout men would have readily consented to the multiplication of festivals, if the time that christians consumed in them, had been employed to advance them in true holiness. But the majority spent the time rather in idleness, and dissipation, and other vices, than in the worship of God. It is well known, among other things, what opportunities of sinning were offered to the licentious, by the *Vigils*, as they were called, of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, [or the *nocturnal meetings*, held on the nights preceding the *Paschal* and *Pentecostal* festivals.]

§ 6. It was believed, that nothing was more effectual to repel the assaults of evil spirits, and to placate the Deity, than *fasting*. Hence it is easy to discover, why the rulers of the church ordained fasts by express laws, and commanded that, as a necessary duty, which was before left at discretion. The *Quadragesimal*, or *Lent fast*, as it was called, was considered more sacred than all the rest; though it was not as yet fixed to a determinate number of days.(13) But it should be remembered, that the fasts of this age differed much from those observed by christians in preceding ages. Anciently, those who undertook to observe a fast, abstained altogether from food and drink; in this age, many deemed it sufficient merely to omit the use of flesh and wine:(14) and this sentiment afterwards became universal among the Latins.

§ 7. For the more convenient administration of *baptism*, sacred

(10) *Godefroi*, Notes on the Codex Theodos. tom. i. p. 143.

(11) See *Beausobre*, Histoire du Manicheisme, tom. ii. p. 693 &c.

(12) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. ii. p. 164. *Alph. du Vignoles*, Disert. in the Bibliothéque German. tom. ii. p. 29.

(13) *Joh. Dailé*, de Jejuniis et Quadragesima, Lib. iv. [The Quadragesimal fast was at first of only 40 hours; afterwards, it was extended to several days and even weeks; and at last settled at 36 days. In the oriental churches, Lent commenced with the seventh week before Easter, because, two days in each week they suspended the fast; but in the western churches, it commenced with the sixth week, because they fasted on the Sundays. Finally, *Gregory* the Great, in the sixth century, or as others say, *Gregory II* in the eighth century, added four days more to this fast, so as to make it full 40 days. In the fourth century, however, the lent fast was in a degree optional; and the people were exhorted, with entreaties, to its observance. See *Baumgarten's* Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthüm, p. 329 &c. Schl.]

(14) See *Joh. Barbeyrac*, de la Morale des Peres, p. 250 &c.

fonts, or *baptisteria*, (15) were erected in the porches of the temples. This sacred rite was always administered, except in cases of necessity when the rule was dispensed with, on the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, accompanied with lighted wax candles, and by the bishop, or by the presbyters whom the bp. commissioned for that purpose. In some places, salt, a symbol of purity and wisdom, was put into the mouth of the baptized; and every where, a double anointing was used, the first before, and the other after, the baptism. After being baptized, the persons appeared clad in white gowns during seven days. The other rites, which were either of temporary duration, or confined to certain countries, are here omitted.

§ 8. The instruction and discipline of the *catechumens* were the same in this century as the preceding. That the *Lord's supper* was administered twice or three times a week, (though in some places, only on Sunday,) to all who assembled for the worship of God, appears from innumerable testimonies. It was also administered at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and at funerals; whence arose, afterwards, the *masses* in honor of the saints, and for the dead. The bread and wine were now every where elevated, before distribution, so that they might be seen by the people, and be viewed with reverence; and hence arose, not long after, the *adoration of the symbols*. Neither *catechumens*, nor *penitents*, nor those who were supposed to be under the power of evil spirits, were allowed to be present at this sacred ordinance; nor did the sacred orators, in their public discourses, venture to speak openly and plainly concerning the true nature of it. The origin of this custom was not very honorable, as has been stated before; yet many offer an honorable excuse for it, by saying, that this concealment might awaken eagerness in the *catechumens* to penetrate early into these mysteries.

(15) [The *Baptisteries* were properly *buildings adjacent* to the churches, in which the *catechumens* were instructed, and where were a sort of cisterns, into which water was let at the time of baptism, and in which the candidates were baptized by immersion. See *Baumgarten's* *Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthüm*, p. 388. *Schl.* See also *Rob. Robertson's* *History of Baptism*, ch. 12. p. 67—73. ed. Benedict, 1817. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE HERESIES.

§ 1. Remains of the former sects.—§ 2, 3. Origin of the Donatist controversy.—§ 4. History of the Donatists.—§ 5, 6. Origin of the Circumcelliones.—§ 7. State of the Donatists under the emperors *Julian* and *Gratian*.—§ 8. Their principal crime.—§ 9. The doctrine of this age concerning the sacred Trinity.—§ 10. The rise of Arianism.—§ 11. Its progress.—§ 12. The Nicene council.—§ 13. History of Arianism after that council.—§ 14. under the sons of Constantine.—§ 15. under Julian, Jovian &c.—§ 16. Sects among the Arians.—§ 17. Heresy of Apollinaris.—§ 18. Marcellus of Ancyra.—§ 19. Heresy of Photinus.—§ 20. That of Macedonius. The council of Constantinople.—§ 21, 22. The Priscillianists.—§ 23. The minor sects. Audaeus.—§ 24, 25. Messalians, or Euchites.

§ 1. The seeds and remains of those sects which were conspicuous in the preceding centuries, continued in this, especially in the East ; nor did they cease to make some proselytes, notwithstanding the absurdity of their opinions. The *Manichæan* sect beyond others, and by its very turpitude, ensnared many ; and often, persons of good talents also, as appears by the example of *Augustine*. This wide spreading pestilence, the most respectable doctors of the age, and among them *Augustine*, when recovered from his infatuation, made efforts to arrest ; some indeed with more learning and discrimination, and others with less, but none of them without some success. But the disease could not be wholly extirpated, either by books or by severe laws,(1) but after remaining latent for a time, and when most people supposed it extinct, it would break out again with greater violence. For the Manichæans, to avoid the severity of the laws, assumed successively various names, as *Encratites*, *Apotactics*, *Saccophori*, *Hydroparastites*, *Solitaries*, &c. and under these names, they often lay concealed for a time ; but not long, for the vigilance of their enemies would find them out.(2)

§ 2. But the state had little to fear from these people, whose

(1) See in the *Codex Theodosianus*, Tom. vi. P. i. ed Ritter. various and peculiarly severe laws of the emperors against the Manichæans. In the year 372, *Valentinian* senior, forbid their holding meetings, and laid their preachers under heavy penalties, p 126. In the year 381, *Theodosius* the Great pronounced them infamous, and deprived them of all the rights of citizens, p. 133. See other laws even more severe than these, p. 137, 138, 170 &c. [The writers who confuted the Manichæans, are very fully enumerated by *Dr. Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 808 &c. *Schl.*]

(2) See the law of *Theodosius*, in the *Codex Theodos.* Tom. vi. p. 134, 136—138.—[The popular names assumed by the Manichæans were, ἐγκραῖται *Continents*, from their condemning marriage ; ἀποστάσιχοι *set apart*, or consecrated to God ; σακκοφόροι *wearers of sackcloth* ; ὑδροπαράσταται *presenters of water*, from their using water only in the eucharist ; and *Solitarii*, *Solitaries*, or monks. *Tr.*]

energies were gradually impaired and oppressed, in the Roman empire, by penal laws and persecutions. A much more threatening storm arose in Africa, which, though small in its commencement, kept both the church and the state in commotion for more than a century. *Mensurius*, the bishop of Carthage in Africa, dying in the year 311, the majority of the people and of the clergy elected *Caecilian*, the arch-deacon, to the vacant chair; and he was consecrated immediately, without waiting for the bishops of Numidia, by the bishops of Africa [Proper, or the province, of which Carthage was the capital.] The Numidian bishops, who, according to custom, should have been present at the consecration, were highly offended at being excluded from the ceremony: and therefore, having assembled at Carthage, they summoned *Caecilian* to appear before them. The feelings of these excited bishops were still more inflamed, by the efforts of certain presbyters of Carthage, especially *Botrus* and *Celesius*, the competitors of *Caecilian*; and by an opulent lady named *Lucilla*, who was unfriendly to *Caecilian*, (by whom she had been reprov'd for her superstition,) and who distributed large sums of money among those Numidians, that they might vigorously oppose the new bishop. Therefore, when *Caecilian* refused to appear before the tribunal of these bishops, seventy in number, and headed by *Secundus* bishop of Tigisis, they proceeded, with the approbation of a considerable part of the clergy and people of Carthage, to pronounce *Caecilian* unworthy of his office; and then created *Majorinus*, his deacon, bishop of Carthage. Hence the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, headed by the two bishops *Caecilian* and *Majorinus*.

§ 3. The Numidians stated two grounds of their sentence against *Caecilian*. (I.) That the principal bishop concerned in his consecration, *Felix* of Aptunga, was a *traditor*; that is, that during the persecution of Diocletian, he had delivered up the sacred books to the magistrates to be burned; and therefore, that he was an apostate from *Christ*, and of course, could not impart the Holy Ghost to the new made bishop. (II.) That *Caecilian* himself, when a deacon, had been hard-hearted and cruel to the witnesses for *Christ*, or the *martyrs*, during the Diocletian persecution; and had forbidden food to be carried to them in prison. To these two causes they added the contumacy of *Caecilian*, who being summoned to a trial before them, refused to appear. Among these Numidian bishops, no one was more ardent and violent, than *Donatus*, the bishop of *Casae Nigrae*; whence, as most writers suppose, the whole party opposed to *Caecilian*, were from him called *Donatists*: though there are those who think the name was derived from the other *Donatus*, whom the Donatists called *the Great*.(3) In a very short time this controversy was

(3) In the Donatist contests, two persons of the name of *Donatus* distinguish-
VOL. I.

diffused over the whole, not only of Numidia, but even of Africa ; and most of the cities had two bishops, one taking sides with *Caecilian*, and the other with *Majorinus*.

§ 4. The Donatists having brought this controversy before *Constantine* the Great, in the year 313, the emperor committed the examination of it to *Melchiades*, the Roman bishop, with whom as assessors, he joined three bishops from Gaul. In this court, *Caecilian* was acquitted of the charges alleged against him ; but the allegations against *Felix* of Aptungis, who had consecrated him, were not examined. The emperor therefore, in the year 314, committed the cause of *Felix* to the separate examination of *Aelian*, his proconsul for Africa, by whom *Felix* was pronounced innocent. But the Donatists raised many exceptions against the decisions of *Melchiades* and *Aelian* ; and especially, they objected to the small number of bishops, who were joined with *Melchiades* as judges. They said, a formal decision of seventy venerable bishops of Numidia, ought undoubtedly to have more weight, than a decree of only nineteen bishops—the number present at Rome(4)—and those, but little acquainted with the transactions in Africa. To quiet these murmurs, the emperor, in the year 314, appointed a much larger tribunal, to meet at Arles, composed of bishops from the provinces of Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain. Here again, the Donatists lost their cause, and appealed to a trial before the emperor himself. He did not reject the appeal, but in the year 316, examined the cause at Milan, the parties being present before him. His decision also was against the Donatists ;(5) and this contumacious

ed themselves ; the one was a Numidian, and bishop of *Casas Nigræ* ; the other, was the second leader of the Donatists, succeeded *Majorinus* as bishop of *Carthage*, and on account of his learning and virtues, was honored by his partizans with the title of the *Great*. The learned have raised the question, From which of these men did the Donatists derive their name ? Arguments of about equal strength may be adduced on both sides of this unimportant question. I should think the name was derived from both. [The Donatists received several names. In the commencement of the schism, they were called, (pars Majorini,) the *Party of Majorinus*. Afterwards, they were called *Donatians* and *Donatists* ; though they would not allow of this name, which was given them by the orthodox. Finally, they were called, (Montenses) *Mountaineers*, (a name which they bore only at Rome ; and either, because they held their meetings in a *mountain*, or because they resembled the *Montanists*,) also *Campitæ*, and *Rupitæ*, [or *Rupitani* ;—because they assembled on the *plains*, and among the clefts of the *rocks*.] *Schl.*]

(4) [“The Emperor, in his letters to *Melchiades*, named no more than three prelates, viz. *Maternus*, *Rheticus*, and *Marinus*, bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, to sit with him as judges of this controversy ; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble ; so that they were at last nineteen in all.” *Macl.*]

(5) No proofs could be more clear, than those afforded by this whole controversy, of the supremacy of the emperor's power in matters of religion. It is obvious, that no person in that age, conceived of a single supreme judge over the whole church, appointed by *Christ* himself. The conventions at Rome and Arles are commonly called *councils* : but whoever views them impartially, will perceive that they were not properly *councils* ; but rather *courts* held by special judges appointed by the emperor ; or, to speak in the language of modern times, *High*

party now cast reproaches on the emperor himself; and complained, that *Hosius*, the bishop of Corduba, who was the friend both of the emperor and *Caecilius*, had corrupted the mind of the former to give an unrighteous decision. This moved the emperor's indignation, and he now (in the year 316) ordered their temples to be taken from them in Africa, and the seditious bishops to be banished; and some of them also—perhaps for the licentiousness of their tongues and pens—he caused to be put to death. Hence arose violent commotions and tumults in Africa; for the Donatist party was very numerous and powerful: and the emperor in vain strove to allay these tumults by his envoys.

§ 5. It was unquestionably, amidst these commotions, that those called *Circumcelliones*(6) first originated; a furious, headlong, sanguinary set, composed of the peasantry and rustic populace, who espousing the cause of the Donatists, defended it by the force of arms, and roaming through the province of Africa, filled it with slaughter, rapine and burnings, and committed the most atrocious crimes against the adverse party. This mad throng, which disregarded death and every evil, nay faced death, when there was occasion, with the greatest audacity, brought extreme odium upon the Donatists: and yet it does not appear, from any competent evidence, that the Donatist bishops, and especially those possessed of any measure of good sense and religion, approved or instigated their proceedings. The storm continuing to increase, and seeming to threaten a civil war, *Constantine*, after attempting a reconciliation without effect, at the suggestion of the prefects of Africa, repealed the laws against the Donatists, [AD. 321.] and gave the African people full liberty, to follow either of the contending parties, as they liked best. [The Donatists now became very numerous throughout Africa. In some places they were more numerous than the Catholics. In the year 330, one of their councils consisted of no less than 270 bishops. See *Augustine*, Ep. 93.]

Commission Courts. [To this opinion, *Dr. Walch* subscribes, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 343 &c. where he says: "The whole history speaks out loudly, that in settling this controversy and restoring peace, the bishop of Rome did nothing, and the emperor every thing. In the numerous transactions, the bishop *Melchiades* appears only once, and then not as supreme head of the church, but merely as the emperor's *commissioner*, charged with the execution of *his* commands. No papal ordinance, no appeal to the court of Rome, no *dernier decision*, was here once thought of. So the ecclesiastical law of Africa in that age, had no article respecting the authority of the pope. On the contrary, from the commencement till the final subjugation of the Donatists, we every where meet with the *emperor*, imperial trials, imperial commissioners, imperial laws, imperial punishments, imperial executive officers, all in full operation." *Schl.*]

(6) [They were called *Circumcelliones* (*vagrants*), or by contraction, *Circeliones*; from the (*cellae*) cottages of the peasants, around which they hovered, having no fixed residence. They styled themselves *Agonistici* (*combatants*), pretending that they were *combating* and vanquishing the Devil. *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit. p. 157, thinks it cannot be proved, that the *Circumcelliones* appeared on the stage, before the time of *Constans*. *Schl.*]

§ 6. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, his son *Constantians*, to whom the African provinces were attached, in the year 348, sent into Africa *Macarius* and *Paulus*, as his lieutenants, to heal this deplorable schism, and to persuade the Donatists to reconciliation with the orthodox. But the chief Donatist bishop, *Donatus*, whom his sect denominated the Great, strenuously opposed a reconciliation; and the other bishops followed his example. The *Circumcelliones* still contended furiously, with slaughter and war, fighting for the party whose interest they espoused. After *Macarius* had vanquished these in battle at Bagnia [or Bagaja,] he no longer recommended peace and reconciliation, but commanded it. A few *Donatists* obeyed; the majority either fled, or were sent into banishment, among whom was *Donatus* the Great; and many suffered the severest punishments. In this persecution of the Donatists, which lasted thirteen years, many things were done, as the *Catholics* themselves concede,(7) which no upright, impartial, and humane person can well say, were righteous and just. And hence the numerous complaints made by the Donatists, of the cruelty of their adversaries.(8)

§ 7. *Julian*, on his accession to the government of the empire, in the year 362, permitted the Donatists to return to their country, and enjoy their former liberty. After their return they drew, in a short time, the greater part of Africa into their communion.(9) *Gratian* enacted indeed some laws against them, and especially in 387, commanded all their temples to be taken from them, and all their assemblies, even in the fields and private houses, to be broken up.(10) But the fury of the *Circumcelliones*, who were the soldiery of the Donatists, and the fear of pro-

(7) I will here give a quotation from *Optatus* of Melevi, whom none will refuse as a witness; de Schismate Donatistor. Lib. iii. § 1. p. 51. ed. *Du Pin*: “Ab Operariis unitatis” (the imperial legates *Macarius* and *Paulus*) “multa quidem aspere gesta sunt.—Fugerunt omnes Episcopi cum clericis suis, aliqui sunt mortui: qui fortiores fuerunt, capti et longe relegati sunt.” Through this whole book, *Optatus* is at much pains to apologise for this severity, the blame of which he casts upon the Donatists. Yet he does not dissemble, that all of it cannot by any means be approved or justified.

(8) See the *Collatio Carthagin.* diei tertiæ § 258. at the end of *Optatus*, p. 315.

(9) When the Donatists returned, under the permission of *Julian*, they demanded of the orthodox the restoration of their churches. And as they were not willing to give them up, and as little could be expected from the civil authorities, the Donatists felt justified in depending upon their own strength. Most unhappy proceedings ensued, which have brought lasting disgrace upon the Donatists. Bloodshed, merciless denial of the necessaries of life, violation of females, in a word, the worst excesses of an oppressed party which, after long continued sufferings felt itself authorised to take unsparing revenge, attended the restoration of the Donatists; and by craft and violence must their churches be built up. The orthodox made resistance, and would not tamely suffer abuse. And hence arose those tumultuous scenes, which the magistrates reported to the court; and very probably, had *Julian* lived a little longer, persecuting laws would have been issued by the government. See *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 175. *Schl.*]

(10) [Codex Theodos. L. ii. ne sanct. Bapt. iteretur. *Schl.*]

ducing intestine war, prevented, no doubt, the vigorous execution of these laws : for it appears that, in the conclusion of this century, the Donatist community in Africa was so extensive, as to have more than 400 bishops. As the century drew to a close, however, two things impaired, not a little, the energies of this very flourishing community. The one was, a great schism that arose in it, occasioned by one *Maximinus*;(11) than which, nothing could more aid the Catholics in opposing the Donatists. The other was, the zeal against them of *Augustine*, first a presbyter, and then bp. of Hippo. For he assailed them most vigorously, in books, in sermons, in conferences, by his advice, by his admonitions, and his activity in conventions ; and being ardent and energetic, he roused against them, not only Africa, but all christendom, as well as the imperial court.(12)

§ 8. the Donatists were sound in doctrine, as their adversaries admit ; nor were their lives censurable, if we except the enormities of the *Circumcelliones*, which were detested by the greatest part of the Donatists. Their fault was, that they regarded the African church as having fallen from the rank and the privileges of a true church, and as being destitute of the gifts of the Holy Spirit ; in consequence of its adherence to *Caccilian*, notwithstanding his offences and those of his consecrator, *Felix* of Aptungis ; and all other churches, which united and communed with that of Africa, they looked upon as defiled and polluted ; and believed that themselves alone, on account of the sanctity of their bishops, merited the name of the true, pure, and holy church ; and in consequence of these opinions, they avoided all communion with other churches, that they might escape defilement. This error led them to maintain, that the sacred rites and administrations of the christians who disagreed with them, were destitute of all efficacy ; and not only to rebaptize those who came over to them from other societies, but to exclude from the sacred office, or reordain, those ministers of religion who joined their community. This schismatic pestilence scarcely extended beyond Africa ; for the few small congregations which they formed in Spain and Italy, had no permanence, but were soon broken up.(13)

(11) [On this schism among the Donatists, and others of less magnitude, see *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 258—267. *Schl.*]

(12) [A full catalogue of the writings of *Augustine* against the Donatists, is given by *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 254 &c. and of his other efforts against them, an account is given, *ibid.* p. 181 &c. We will make here a single remark ; that it was during these contests, *Augustine* first exhibited in his writings, that horrid principle ; *Heretics are to be punished with temporal punishments and death* ;—a principle wholly inconsistent with christianity, and one which, in after ages, served as an excuse for inhuman cruelties. Only read *Augustine's* 48th Epistle, ad Vincent. and his 50th, ad Bonifac. and several others ; and you will there meet with all the plausible arguments, which the spirit of persecution in after ages so dressed up—to the disgrace of christianity—as to blind the eyes of kings. *Schl.*]

(13) A more full account of the Donatists, is given by *Hcn. Valesius*, *Diss. de*

§ 9. Not long after the commencement of the Donatist controversy, or in the year 317, another storm arose, in Egypt, more pernicious and of greater consequence, which spread its ravages over the whole christian world. The ground of this contest was, the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead*; a doctrine which, during the three preceding centuries, had not been in all respects defined. It had indeed often been decided, in opposition to the Sabellians and others, that there is a *real* difference between the Father and the Son, and also between them and the Holy Spirit; or, as we commonly express it, that there are three distinct persons in the Godhead. But the mutual relations of these persons, and the nature of the difference between them, had not been a subject of dispute, and therefore nothing had been decreed by the church on these points. Much less was there any prescribed phraseology, which it was necessary to use when speaking on this mystery. The doctors, therefore, explained this subject, in different ways, and gave various representations of the difference between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without offence being taken. In Egypt and the neighboring countries, the greater part had, in this article as well as others, followed the opinions of *Origen*; who taught, that the *Son* is *in God*, what *reason* is *in man*, and that the Holy Spirit is nothing else but the *divine energy* or *power of acting* and working; which opinion, if it be not cautiously stated, may lead, among other difficulties, to the subversion of any real distinction between the divine persons, or in other words to Sabellianism.

§ 10. *Alexander*, the bishop of Alexandria,—it is uncertain, on what occasion,—expressed himself very freely on this subject in a meeting of his presbyters; and maintained, among other things, that the Son possesses, not only the same dignity as the Father, but also the same *essence*.⁽¹⁴⁾ But *Arius*, one of the presbyters, a man of an acute mind and fluent, influenced perhaps by ill will towards his bishop,⁽¹⁵⁾ at first denied the truth of *Alex-*

schismate Donatistarum; which is subjoined to his edition of *Eusebius' Historia Ecclesiastica*:—by *Tho. Ittig*, *Historia Donatismi*; in an appendix to his book, *de Haeresibus aevi Apostolici*, p. 241.—by *Herm. Witsius*, *Miscellaneor. sacrar.* tom. i. Lib. iv. p. 742.—by *Hen. Noris*, *Historia Donatiana*; a posthumous work, which the brothers *Ballerini* enlarged and published, *Opp.* tom. iv. p. xlv &c.—and by *Tho. Long*, *History of the Donatists*, Lond. 1677. 8vo. The narrative we have given above, is derived from the original sources; and, if our life is spared, it will in due time be corroborated by a statement of the requisite testimonies. [What chancellor *Mosheim* was prevented from fulfilling, by his death, his successor in the professorial chair of church history, *Dr. Walch*, has now accomplished, to the satisfaction of all the friends of this branch of knowledge, in the IVth volume of his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, p. 1—354. *Schl.*]

(14) See *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 5. *Theodoret*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 2.

(15) [A historian should be cautious of judging of the motives of human actions; for there are cases, in which a man's motives are discernible only to the eye of Omniscience. The present is such a case. Here we can express only a dubious "*perhaps*," when we impartially survey the sources of the history of

ander's positions, on the ground that they were allied to the Sabelian errors, which were condemned by the church : and then, going to the opposite extreme, he maintained, that the Son is totally and *essentially* distinct from the Father ; that he was only the first and noblest of those created beings whom God the Father formed out of nothing, and the instrument which the Father used in creating this material universe ; and therefore, that he was inferior to the Father both in *nature* and in *dignity*.(16) What

Arius. We commonly read, it is true, that ambition of distinction led *Arius* to contradict his bishop. But this cannot be proved by credible testimony : and his opposers, *Alexander* and *Athanasius*, who would surely have used this fact to his disadvantage, if it had been known to them, observe a profound silence on the subject. On the contrary, *Philostorgius* relates, (Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 3.) that *Arius*, when the votes of the electors were very favorable to himself, modestly directed the choice on *Alexander*. *Philostorgius*, it must be owned, was an Arian in sentiment, and his testimony is of no great weight. But the direct contrary to what he states, is not capable of proof. The motives, therefore, which actuated *Arius*, in opposing his bishop, must be regarded as dubious. Probably something of human infirmity was found on both sides. The conduct of *Arius* in the contest itself, betrays pride, a conceit of learning, and a contentious disposition. On the other hand, the Arians complain, that *Alexander* was actuated by envy and personal hatred of *Arius*, because the great popularity of *Arius* had excited his jealousy. See *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 395 &c. Schl.]

(16) [Both *Alexander* and *Arius* have left us statements, each of his own doctrinal views, and also of what he understood to be the sentiments of his antagonist. The statements are in their private letters, written after long and public discussions at Alexandria, and when *Arius* and his friends were cast out of the church. The letter of *Alexander* is addressed to his namesake, *Alexander* of Byzantium, since Constantinople ; and that of *Arius* to his friend *Eusebius* of Nicomedia. Both are preserved by *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccl. L. i. c. 4, 5. It may gratify the reader, who has not access to the original, to peruse the following extracts, containing the grand points, as originally contested in the great Arian controversy, and in the language of the first combatants.—*Alexander* states that *Arius* and his adherents, Denying the divinity of our Saviour, pronounced him τοῖς καὶ ἄλλοις ἰσὺν εἶναι on a level with all other creatures. He says that they held, there was a time, when the Son of God was not : and he who once had no existence, afterwards did exist ; and from that time was, what every man naturally is : for (say they) God made all things of nothing, including the Son of God in this creation of all things both rational and irrational : and of course, pronouncing him to be of a changeable nature, and capable of virtue and of sin.—The doctrine just risen up in opposition to the piety of the church, is that of *Elion* and *Artemas*, and is an imitation of that of *Paul of Samosata*. *Alexander* then gives his own views, as follows : We believe, as the Apostolic church does, in the only unbegotten Father, who derived his existence from no one, and is immutable and unalterable, always the same and uniform, unsusceptible of increase or diminution ; the giver of the law and the prophets and the gospels ; Lord of the patriarchs and apostles and of all saints : and in one Lord, Jesus Christ ; the only begotten Son of God ; not begotten from nothing, but from the living Father ; and not after the manner of material bodies, by separations and effluxes of parts, as *Sabellius* and *Valentinian* supposed ; but in an inexplicable and indescribable manner, agreeably to the declaration before quoted. Who shall declare his generation ? For his existence (ὑπόστασις) is inscrutable to all mortal beings ; just as the Father is inscrutable ; because created intelligences are incapable of understanding this divine generation from the Father.—No one knoweth what the Father is, but the Son ; and no one knoweth what the Son is, but the Father.—He is unchangeable, as much as the Father ; lacks nothing ; is the perfect Son, and the absolute likeness of the Father, save only that he is not unbegotten.—Therefore to the unbegotten Father, his proper dignity (ὁικτιῶν δόξα) must be preserved. And to the Son also suitable honor must be given, by ascribing

were his views of the Holy Spirit, is not equally manifest. That his views of the Son of God were combined with some other opinions differing from the common sentiments of christians, cannot be doubted.(17) But no one of the ancients has left us a connected and systematic account of the religion professed by *Arius* and his associates.(18)

to him an eternal generation (*ἀναρχὸν γέννησιν*) from the Father. Such is the statement of *Alexander*.—The letter of *Arius* is as follows: To his very dear lord, that man of God, the faithful, orthodox *Eusebius*; *Arius*, who is unjustly persecuted by the bp. *Alexander*, on account of that all-conquering truth which thou also defendest, greeting in the Lord. As my father *Ammonius* is going to *Nicomedia*, it seemed proper for me to address you by him, and to acquaint the native love and affection which you exercise towards the brethren for God and his Christ's sake, that the bp. greatly oppresses and persecutes us, putting every thing in motion against us; and so as to drive us out of the city, as if we were atheists; because we do not agree with him, publicly asserting, that God always was, and the Son always was; that he was always the Father, always the Son; that the Son was of God himself; and that because your brother *Eusebius* of *Cesarea*, and *Theodotus*, and *Paulinus* and *Athanasius* and *Gregory* and *Aetius*, and all they of the East, say that God was before the Son, and without beginning, they are accursed; except only *Philogonius* and *Hellanicus* and *Macarius*, unlearned and heretical men, who say of the Son, one of them, that he is an eruption, another, that he is an emission, and another, that he is equally unbegotten; which impieties we could not even hear, though the heretics should threaten us with a thousand deaths. As to what we say and believe, we have taught, and still teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a portion of the unbegotten, in any manner: nor was he formed out of any subjacent matter, but that, in will and purpose, he existed before all times and before all worlds, perfect God (*πλήρης θεός*) the only-begotten, unchangeable; and that before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established, he was not; for he was never unbegotten. We are persecuted, because we say; the Son had a beginning, but God was without beginning. We are also persecuted, because we say; that he is from nothing (*ἐξ ἑκ ὅτων ἐστίν*); and this we say, in as much as he is not a portion of God, nor formed from any subjacent matter. Therefore we are persecuted. The rest you know. I bid you adieu in the Lord.—According to these statements, both the Arians and the orthodox considered the Son of God and Savior of the world, as a derived existence, and as generated by the Father. But they differed on two points. I. The Orthodox believed his generation was from eternity, so that he was coeval with the Father. But the Arians believed, there was a time, when the Son was not. II. The Orthodox believed the Son to be derived of and from the Father; so that he was *ὁμοούσιος* of the same essence with the Father. But the Arians believed, that he was formed out of nothing *ἐξ ἑκ ὅτων εἶναι*, by the creative power of God. Both however, agreed in calling him God, and in ascribing to him divine perfections. As to his offices, or his being the Saviour of sinful men, it does not appear, that they differed materially in their views. (See pa. 345, and Note 21.) Indeed, so imperfect and fluctuating were the views of that age, respecting the offices of *Christ* and the way in which sinners are saved, that he was, for aught they could see, an equally competent Saviour, whether he were a finite creature, or the infinite and all-perfect God. Hence both the Arians and the orthodox then embraced the same system of theology in substance; and the chief importance, in a theological view, of their controversy respecting the Sonship of *Christ*, related to the assigning him that rank in the universe which properly belonged to him. Tr.]

(17) [This conjecture of *Dr. Mosheim* (which his former translator has swelled into a strong affirmation,) appears to be gratuitous. See the preceding Note. Tr.]

(18) The history of the Arian contests is to be drawn from *Eusebius*, de Vita *Constantini Magni*; from various tracts of *Athanasius*, Opp. Tom. i; from the Eccles. Histories of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*; from *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxi; and from other writers of this and the following century. But among all these, there is not one whom we may justly pronounce free from partiality. And

§ 11. The opinions of *Arius* were no sooner divulged, than they found very many abettors, and among them men of distinguished talents and rank, both in Egypt and the neighboring provinces. *Alexander*, on the other hand, accused *Arius* of blasphemy, before two councils assembled at Alexandria, and cast him out of the church.(19) He was not discouraged by this disgrace, but retiring to Palestine, he wrote various letters to men of distinction, in which he labored to demonstrate the truth of his doctrines, and with so much success that he drew over immense numbers to his side, and in particular *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, who was a man of vast influence.(20) The emperor, *Constantine*, who considered the discussion as relating to a matter of little importance and remote from the fundamentals of religion, at first addressed the disputants by letter, admonishing them to desist from contention.(21) But when he found that nothing

the Arian history still needs a writer of integrity and void alike of hatred and love. There were faults on both sides; but those who hitherto have described this controversy, could discover the faults of only one of the parties. [This has now ceased to be absolutely true; since Dr. *Walch*, in the II^d vol. of his *Geschichte der Ketzereyen*, p. 385—700, has so treated the history of Arius and his followers, that a man must himself be in the highest degree partial, if he can deny the honor of impartiality to Dr. *Walch*. *Schl.*] It is a common opinion, that *Arius* was too much attached to the sentiments of *Plato* and *Origen*. See *Dion. Petavius*, *Dogmat. Theol.* Tom. ii. L. i. c. 8. p. 38. But those who think so, are certainly in an error. For *Origen* and *Plato* differ widely from *Arius*; on the contrary it cannot well be doubted, that *Alexander*, the opposer of Arius, in his explanation of the doctrine of three persons in one God, closely followed the footsteps of *Origen*. See *Ralph Cudworth's* *Intellectual System*, vol. i. p. 676 &c.

(19) [*Alexander* first employed milder measures; for he sent a letter, which was subscribed by the clergy of Alexandria, to *Arius* and the other clergymen united with him, warning them to abandon their error. (*Athanasius*, *Opp.* Tom. i. Pt. i. p. 396.) When this measure failed, he brought the subject before the bishops of his party. He first held a council at Alexandria (AD. 321.) composed of Egyptian and Libyan bishops; and then another assembly, composed only of the presbyters and deacons of the city of Alexandria and the province of *Mareotis*. The first was properly a council; the other was not. And hence it is, that some historians speak of but *one* council of Alexandria. See Dr. *Walch's* *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 140. and his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 424 &c. *Schl.*]

(20) [These bishops held a council, in Bithynia, probably at *Nicomedia*, in which 250 bishops are reported to have been present. Of their acts and decisions, we know nothing more than, that they sent letters to all the bishops of christendom, intreating them not to exclude the friends of Arius from their communion, and requesting them to intercede with *Alexander* that he would not do so.—This first Arian council is either wholly overlooked by modern writers, or is confounded with that of Antioch in the year 330. *Sozomen* gives account of it; *Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 15. See *Nicetas*, in *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* Tom. xxv. p. 151. and *Ceiller's* *Histoire des Auteurs*, Tome iii. p. 566. *Walch*, *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 142. *Tr.*]

(21) [*Constantine* not only wrote a letter, in the year 324, but he sent with it, as his envoy, the famous *Hosius* bishop of Corduba. What part the envoy acted, is unknown, but the letter is extant, fully, in *Eusebius*, *de Vita Constantini* M. Lib. ii. c. 64—72, and with some curtailment, in *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. i. c. 7. The most important part of this singular document, which however, shows the feelings of one more solicitous for the great cause of our common christianity, than for absolute perfection in speculative theology, is as follows.

“I learn, then, that the origin of the present controversy was thus. Whereas

was effected by this measure, and that greater commotion was daily rising throughout the empire, he in the year 325 summoned

you, *Alexander*, enquired of the presbyters, what each believed on one of the subjects contained in the law, or rather on a point of a vain controversy ; and whereas you, *Arius*, inconsiderately advanced, what ought not to have entered your mind, or if it did, should have been smothered in silence ; hereupon dissension arose between you, communion has been denied, and the most holy people, being split into two parties, the harmony of the whole body is destroyed. Wherefore do ye, mutually forgiving one another, follow the counsel here fitly offered you by your fellow worshipper [of the true God.] And what is it ? It is, that it was unsuitable, at first, to put a question on such subjects ; and when it was put, it was unsuitable to answer it. For such questions, being required by no law, but prompted by the contentiousness of unprofitable leisure,—though they may be proposed for the exercise of our natural powers,—ought to be kept to ourselves, and not rashly to be brought before public meetings, nor be inconsiderately trusted to the ears of the people. For, how few are there that can accurately comprehend and suitably explain the nature of so great and so exceedingly difficult subjects ? Yet if any one thinks he could easily do this, how large a part of the people will he persuade to think so ? or who can urge the critical examination of such questions, without hazarding a fall. Wherefore prating on such subjects, is to be restrained ; lest, either from the imbecility of our natures, we should be unable to explain the subject proposed, or from the dulness of apprehension in our hearers, they should not be able to comprehend exactly what is spoken ; and lest, from one or the other of these causes, the people should incur the danger either of blasphemy or schism. Therefore let an unwise question in the one, and an inconsiderate answer in the other of you, mutually pardon each other. For the controversy between you, is not about the chief of the precepts of our law (the holy scripture) ; nor have you introduced any new heresy relating to practical religion ; but you both have one and the same views, so that you may easily come together in the bonds of fellowship. While you thus contend about little and exceedingly unimportant points (ὕπερ μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἐλαχίστων), it is not suitable for so numerous a body of God's people to be under your guidance, on account of your dissension : indeed, it is not only unsuitable, but it is believed to be absolutely unlawful. That I may admonish your sagacity, by a smaller instance, I will say ; all those philosophers who profess one system of doctrine, you know, very often differ on some part of their positions. But though they disagree in the perfection of their knowledge, yet on account of their union as to the system of their doctrine, they come together again harmoniously. Now if they do so, how much more reasonable is it for you, the appointed ministers of the great God, to be of one heart in the profession of the same religion. Let us look more attentively and closely into what is now advanced. Is it right, on account of the little vain disputes about words among you, for brethren to array themselves against brethren, and the precious assembly to be rent asunder by the ungodly strife of you who thus contend about trifles of no consequence ? (ὕπερ μικρῶν ἔγω καὶ μηδαμῶς ἀναγκαίων ;) This is vulgar and despicable : it is more befitting the folly of children, than the discretion of priests and wise men. Let us spontaneously depart from the temptations of the devil. Our great God, the common preserver of us all, hath extended to all the common light ; and allow me his servant, under his providence, to bring my efforts to a successful issue, that by my admonitions, diligence, and earnest exhortations, I may bring his people to have fellowship in their meeting together. For since, as I said, ye both have one faith (μία τις ἐστὶν ὑμῖν πίστις), and one and the same understanding of our religion (καὶ μία τῆς κατ' ἡμᾶς διδασκῆς σύνεσις) ; and since the requirement of the law, in its various parts, binds all to one consent and purpose of mind ; and as this thing which has produced a little strife among you, does not extend to the power and efficacy of the whole gospel, (μὴ πρὸς τὴν εἰς παντὸς δόναμιν ἀνέχει,) let it not at all produce separations and commotions among you. And these things I say, not to compel you to a perfect consent on this very unwise and undefinable question. For the high privileges of communion may be preserved to you unimpaired, and the same fellowship may be kept up among you all, though there may be among you par-

that famous council of the whole church, which met at *Nice* in Bithynia, to put an end to this controversy. In this council, after various altercations and conflicts of the bishops, the doctrine of *Arius* was condemned, *Christ* was pronounced to be (*ὁμοούσιος*) of the same essence with the Father, *Arius* was sent into exile in Illyricum, and his followers were compelled to assent to a *creed* or confession of faith, composed by the council. (22)

§ 12. No part of church history, perhaps, has acquired more celebrity, than this assembly of bishops at *Nice* to settle the af-

tial disagreement about some trivial point. For we do not all choose alike, nor is there one and the same disposition and judgment in us all. Therefore concerning the divine providence, let there be one faith, one understanding, and one covenant with God. But as for those trivial questions, which ye so elaborately discuss, though you should not think exactly alike, it is fit that the fact remain within your own cogitations, and be kept as a secret in your own breast. Let the privileges of mutual friendship, and the belief of the truth, and the precious worship of God and observance of his law, remain unimpaired among you. Return again to mutual friendship and charity; give to all the people their proper embraces; and, having purified as it were your own minds, do ye again recognize each other: for friendship, when it returns to a reconciliation, after ill will is laid aside, often becomes more sweet than before. And restore to me also serene days, and nights void of care; so that there may be in reserve for me the enjoyment of the pure light, and the pleasures of a quiet life. If this fail, I must unavoidably sigh and be bathed in tears, and spend the residue of my days unquietly. For while the people of God, my fellow worshippers, are so rent asunder by unreasonable and hurtful contentions, how can my mind be at ease and my thoughts at rest?" *Tr.*]

(22) This *creed* is illustrated from ancient records, in a learned work on the subject, by *Joh. Christ. Suicer*, Utrecht, 1718. 4to. [The *creed* used in the Catholic, Lutheran, and English churches, and called the *Nicene* *creed*, is in reality the *creed* set forth by the council of *Constantinople* in the year 381. It is considerably more full than the original *Nicene* *creed*; which is here subjoined, together with a translation. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τετέλεσται, ἐκ τῆς ἐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί. δι' ὃ καὶ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ. τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα. παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Τὰς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε ἄνθρωπος ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐξ ἐκ τῶν ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεις ἢ ἐσίας φάσκοντες εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν τρεπτόν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. See *Walch*, *Biblioth. Symbol. Vetus*, p. 75, 76. Translation: We believe in one God, the Father, almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, (that is,) of the substance of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and that are in earth: who for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and was incarnate, and became man: suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens; and will come to judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, that there was a time when he was not, and that he was not, before he was begotten, and that he was made out of nothing, or affirm that he is of any other substance or essence, or that the Son of God is created, and mutable or changeable, the catholic church doth pronounce accursed. *Tr.*]

fairs of the church ; and yet, it is very singular, that scarcely any part of ecclesiastical history has been investigated and explained more negligently.(23) The ancient writers are not agreed as to the time and year, nor the place, nor the number of the judges, nor the president of this council, nor as to many other particulars.(24) No written *journal* of the proceedings of this venera-

(23) See *Tho. Ittig*, *Historia Concilii Niceni*; published after his death, [Lips. 1712. 4to.] *Jo. le Clerc*, *Bibliothèque historique et universelle*, Tome x. p. 421, and Tome xxii. p. 291. *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire de Manichéisme et de Manichéisme*, Tome i. p. 520 &c. The accounts left us by the orientals of this council, are contained in *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 69 &c. [To the preceding works, may be added, *Chr. W. Fr. Walch's* *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 144—158. *Schl.*]

(24) [Yet there is not great disagreement on most of these points. There is scarcely a dissenting voice as to the *year*, which was AD. 325; though there is a disagreement as to the *month* when the council first met; namely, whether it was the 13th of the Kalends of June, or July; that is, the 20th of *May*, or the 19th of *June*. All agree that the council closed on the emperor's Vicennalia, in July of that year. As to the *place*, there is overwhelming proof that it was the central hall or building in the imperial palace at *Nice* in Bithynia; which the emperor caused to be fitted up especially for the purpose. Some moderns, however, maintain that this *hall* must have been a *church*; because they cannot believe so holy a body would assemble any where, except in a church duly consecrated. As to the *number of members*, of which the council was composed, *Eusebius* indeed, (*de Vita Constantini*, iii. c. 8.) says "they exceeded 250 bishops." But the M. S. here, is believed to be corrupted; for *Socrates* (*Hist. Eccles.* i. c. 8.) expressly quoting this passage of *Eusebius*, says "they exceeded three hundred bishops." There is satisfactory proof that there were 318 members of the council; besides a vast number of clergymen and others, who attended from curiosity or for their own improvement in knowledge. The ancient writers make no mention whatever of any *president* or *scribe* of the council. They represent the council as assembling, and the emperor as entering, advancing to the upper end of the hall, and upon a signal from the bishops, taking his seat, which was a golden chair; after which the whole council was seated; several of the principal bishops on the right and left of the emperor, and the main body of them arranged on the two sides of the hall. Before this formal opening of the council, there were several rencountres of the bishops of different parties, and also of members of the council, with the philosophers and others who were assembled in the city. Of these private meetings, pompous accounts are left us by *Gelasius* and others. But when the council assembled in form, they did no business, but remained silent, till the emperor came in. He was then addressed either by *Eustathius* of Antioch, or by *Eusebius* of Cesarea, or by both, in short complimentary speeches; after which he himself harrangued the council; and having thrown into the fire, unread, all the private petitions and complaints which had been previously handed him; he bid them proceed to business. A free discussion now ensued; but, it would seem, without the formalities observed in modern deliberative assemblies. Individuals of different sentiments offered their opinions; and the emperor heard, remarked, commended, or disapproved, and so influenced the whole proceedings, as to bring about a good degree of unanimity. Yet he did not act the dictator, or judge; but left the bishops to decide all the questions respecting faith and discipline, uncontrolled: for he regarded *them* as the divinely constituted judges of such matters. He only wished them to come to *some* agreement; which as soon as they had done, he regarded their decision as final, and as obligatory on himself as well as all others. How many sessions were held, we are not told. But after all the business was finished, on the 24th of July, when the emperor entered on the 20th year of his reign, he celebrated his Vicennalia with the council, in a splendid banquet in his own palace. On that occasion *Eusebius* of Cesarea, delivered an oration in praise of *Constantine*, which is lost. After the feast, the bishops were dismissed, with presents and exhortations to peace and love. They returned, as they came, by the public

ble tribunal was kept ; at least none has reached us.(25) How many and what *canons*, or ecclesiastical *laws*, were enacted, is not agreed on by the oriental and the occidental christians. The latter tell us they were only 20 in number ; but the orientals make them far more numerous.(26) From the canons univer-

conveyances, having been supported by the emperor from the time they left their homes. See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, L. iii. c. 6—22. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. i. 8—11. *Sozomen*, H. E. i. 17—25. *Theodoret*, H. E. i. 7, 9, 10, 12. *Rufinus*, H. E. Lib. i. *Gelasius* Cyzicenus, Commentar. de Synodo Nicaeno, Lib. iii, in *Harduin's* Concilia, Tom. i. p. 345 &c. Acta Concilii Nicaeni, in *Combesis* Auctarium Biblioth. Patr. tom. ii. p. 573. *Renaudot*, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor. p. 69 &c. various Treatises in the 1st volume of the works of *Athanasius*, especially his Epistola de Nicaenis Decretis ; and several detached passages in *Epiphanius*, contra Haereses, Lib. iii. These are the only authentic sources for the history of this council. Tr.]

(25) See *Henry Valesius*, Note on *Euseb.* de Vita Constantini M. Lib. iii. c. 14. *Maruthas*, a Syrian, wrote a history of this council ; but it is lost. See *Jos. Sim. Assemani* Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic. Tom. i. p. 195 &c. [*Eusebius*, in the passage just referred to, says : "What met the general approbation of the council, was committed to writing, and confirmed by the subscription of each member." Whence *Valesius* infers, that *nothing* was committed to writing by the council, except the *results* to which they came, and which they individually subscribed ; namely, the *creed*, the *canons*, and the *synodic epistle*, which was addressed to the church of Alexandria and the brethren in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. He therefore supposes, the council kept no *Journal*, or had no written *Acta Concilii*, in the technical sense of the phrase. And indeed, we have no intimation that they kept any journal of their proceedings, or had any proper scribe of council. What are called the Acta Concilii, as given us by *Gelasius* and others, are an account of various discussions between individual members of the council and certain philosophers or sophists, together with the creed, the canons, the synodic letter, several epistles of the emperor, one of *Eusebius* to his church of Cesarea, and various extracts from ancient authors. Tr.]

(26) *Thom. Ittig*, Supplem. Opp. Clementis Alex. p. 191. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic. Tom. I. p. 22, 195 &c. *Euseb.* *Renaudot*, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor. p. 71. and many others. [The 20 Nicene canons, and those only, were received by the ancient church. Some attempts, indeed, were made by the bishops of Rome, in the fifth century, to make certain canons of the council of *Sardiea* pass for canons of the council of Nice. On that occasion, the African bishops resisted, and sent to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, for complete copies of all the Nicene canons, which they knew of. The returns shewed, that these 20 canons, and these only, were then recognized in the Greek church. See the Acts of the 6th council of Carthage, AD. 419. *Theodoret* also, (H. E. i. 8.) and *Gelasius* Cyzicenus, (Lib. ii. c. 31.) expressly affirm, that the number of the Nicene canons was 20. But in the 16th century an Arabic copy of 80 canons, including these 20, was brought from Alexandria to Rome, and soon afterwards translated and published. At first there was some doubt ; but in a short time all the learned were fully satisfied, that the additional 60 canons were not of Nicene origin, though now regarded as such by most of the eastern sects. See *Natalis Alexander*, Hist. Eccles. Cent. iv. Dissert. xviii. vol. vii. p. 501—511. ed. Paris 1742, 4to.—These 20 canons, (or 22, as some divide them,) are extant in *Beveridge's* Pandect. Canon. Tom. i. p. 58 &c. and in all the larger Collections of councils.—The substance of them, is as follows. The 1st cannon forbids the admission of voluntary, or self-made eunuchs to the sacred ministry. The 2d forbids the hasty ordination of new converts to christianity ; agreeably to 1 Tim. iii. 6. *Not a novice* &c. The 3d forbids clergymen of all ranks, from having subinduced females or housekeepers ; except only their nearest blood relations. The 4th directs, that ordinations be generally performed by all the bishops of a province ; and never, by less than three bishops : and requires the confirmation of the metropolitan, in all cases. The 5th requires, that an excommunication, either of a clergyman or a layman, by the sentence of a single bishop, shall be valid every where, till it is examined and judged of by

sally received, and from the other monuments of the council, it appears, not only that *Arius* was condemned by this council, but that other things were decreed, with a view to settle the affairs of the church. In particular, the controversy respecting the time of celebrating Easter, which had long perplexed christians, was terminated; the Novatian disturbance, respecting the readmission of the lapsed to communion was composed; the Meletian schism, with its causes, was censured; the jurisdiction of the greater bishops was defined; and several other matters of a like nature determined.(27) But while the prelates were eager to correct

a provincial council; and requires such a council to be held, for this and other objects of general interest, twice a year, once in the autumn, and once a little before Easter. The 6th secures to the patriarch of *Alexandria* all the rights, which he claimed by ancient usage, over the bishops and churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; also to the patriarchs of *Rome* and *Antioch*, their prerogatives; and gives to metropolitans, generally, a negative on all elections to the episcopal office within their respective provinces. The 7th gives to the bishop of *Adia* (or Jerusalem) the rank of a metropolitan; but without depriving *Cesarea*, the ancient metropolis, of its dignity. The 8th permits *Novatian* bishops and clergymen to return to the church and retain their rank and offices, on their assenting to the rules of the church respecting second marriages and communion with the lapsed. The 9th and 10th require, that presbyters, who before their ordination had lapsed, or had committed any other offence which was a canonical disqualification for the sacred office, be deprived of their office as soon as the disqualification is ascertained. The 11th requires the lapsed, during the late persecution under *Licinius*, first to do penance three years without the doors of the church; secondly six years in the porch among the catechumens; and thirdly to be allowed to witness, but not join in, the celebration of the eucharist for two years more. The 12th requires flagrant apostates to go through the same course; but they must spend ten years in the second stage. Yet the bishops are to exercise discretionary power in regard to the length of time. The 13th allows the sacrament to be given to any penitent who seems to be dying; but if he recovers, he is to rank only with the penitents in the third stage.—By the 14th, lapsed catechumens are to spend three years in the first stage, or among those who worship without the doors of the church. By the 15th, the translation of bishops, presbyters, and deacons from one church to another, is forbidden. By the 16th, presbyters or deacons, forsaking their own church and going over to others, are to be denied communion, and be sent back: bishops also are forbidden to ordain the subjects of other bishops, without their consent. The 17th requires the deposition of all clergymen, who loan money or goods on interest. By the 18th, deacons are forbidden to present the bread and wine to the presbyters, or to taste them before the bishop, or to sit among the presbyters. By the 19th, the followers of *Paul* of Samosata, on returning to the church, are to be re-baptized; and to be re-ordained, before they can officiate as clergymen. The 20th disapproves of kneeling at prayers on the Lord's day, and from Easter to Pentecost. Tr.]

(27) [The synodic epistle, which is preserved by *Socrates*, H. E. i. 9, and by *Theodoret*, H. E. i. 9. acquaints us with the principal transactions of the council; and also shews the spirit of that venerable body. It is as follows. "To the great and holy, by the grace of God, the church of the Alexandrians; and to the beloved brethren of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; the bishops assembled at Nice, and composing the great and holy synod, send greeting in the Lord.

"Forasmuch as, by the grace of God, the most pious emperor *Constantine*, having called us together from various cities and provinces, a great and holy synod is assembled at Nice; it seemed altogether necessary that an epistle be sent to you, in the name of the sacred synod; that you may have means of knowing, what things have been moved, and examined, and what have been sanctioned. First of all, then, an inquiry was made, in the presence of the most pious emperor *Constantine*, into the impiety and iniquity of *Arius* and his associates; and it was determined by the voice of all, that his impious doctrine is to be anathematized, as also the blasphemous words and terms he used, he having blasphemous-

the faults of others, they narrowly escaped falling into a great one themselves. For they were on the point of imposing celibacy on the clergy by an express law; but the act was prevented by *Paphnutius*, who had himself lived all his days in celibacy.(28)

§ 13. But the passions of men were more efficient, than either

ly said that, *the Son of God was from nothing*, and *there was a time when he was not*; and saying that *the Son of God, by the arbitrament of his will, is capable of either virtue or vice*; and pronouncing him *a creature and a work*: all which the holy synod hath anathematized, not enduring so much as to hear this impious doctrine, or rather madness, and these blasphemous words. What was the issue of the proceedings against him, ye have heard already, or will hear; lest we should seem to insult over a man who has received the deserved recompense of his wickedness. But his impiety prevailed so far as to involve in destruction with him *Theonas* of Marmarica, and *Secundus* of Ptolemais: for they received the same sentence. After the grace of God had delivered us from that evil doctrine and impiety and blasphemy, and from the persons who dared to raise discord and division among a once peaceable people; there yet remained the rashness of *Meletius* and of those ordained by him. And what the synod decreed on this subject, beloved brethren, we now inform you. It was determined that *Meletius* (whom the synod treated with more lenity; for, according to the strictness of law, he deserved no indulgence) should remain in his own city; but should have no authority, either to ordain, to nominate for office, or be seen in any other city or place on such business; but should only possess the naked title of honor. As for those raised to office by him, after being confirmed by a more solemn consecration, fellowship is to be given them; yet on the condition, that they so hold their office and ministry, as always to take rank after all in every parish or church who were examined and ordained previously by our dearest colleague *Alexander*; and moreover, have no authority to elect or to nominate such persons as they like, or indeed to do any thing, without the consent of some bishop of the catholic church who is *Alexander's* suffragan. But those who, by the grace of God and by your prayers, have never been found in any schism, but have remained blameless in the catholic church, shall have power to nominate and elect such as are worthy of the sacred office, and in general, to do every thing that accords with law and ecclesiastical usage. And if it happen, that any of those now [bishops] in the church should be removed by death, then let those lately admitted be advanced to the honors of the deceased; provided always, that they appear deserving, and the people choose them, and that the bishop of Alexandria concur in the election and confirm it. And this privilege is conceded to all others; but not so in regard to *Meletius* personally, to whom, on account of his former irregularity and his headlong rashness of temper, it is judged, no power or authority should be given, he being capable of again exciting the same disorders. And these are the things which relate particularly and especially to Egypt, and to the most holy church of Alexandria. But if any other canon or decree shall be made, as our lord and most precious fellow minister and brother is present with us, when he shall arrive he will give you a more exact account, for he will have been an actor and co-operator in the things done. We also announce to you the harmony there is, in regard to the most holy paschal feast; that this matter is happily settled, through the assistance of your prayers, so that all the brethren in the East, who before kept the festival with the Jews, will hereafter keep it in harmony with the Romans, with us, and with all those who from ancient times have kept it with us. Therefore, rejoicing in the happy issue of affairs, and the peaceful harmony that exists, and that all heresy is extirpated, do ye receive, with greater honor and more ardent love, our fellow minister and your bishop, *Alexander*, who has gladdened us with his presence, encountering so great labor in his advanced age, that peace might be restored among you. And pray for us all, that whatever has been well determined upon, may remain steadfast, through our Lord Jesus Christ, being done, as we trust, according to the good pleasure of God the Father, in the Holy Spirit: to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen." Tr.]

(28) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. c. 11. compare *Fran. Baldwin's* *Constantinus Magnus*, p. 76. and *Geor. Calixtus*, de conjugio Cleric. p. 170 &c.

the decrees of the Nicene council or the authority of the emperor. For there were those, who though they did not fall in with the doctrine of *Arius*, yet were dissatisfied with some things in the decrees and the creed of the council;(29) and the *Arians* left no means untried, to free themselves from the evils inflicted on them by those decrees. And the issue was favorable to their wishes. For in a few years after the Nicene council, an Arian presbyter, whom *Constantia*, the emperor's sister, at her death had recommended to the care of her brother, succeeded in persuading *Constantine* the Great, that *Arius* had been wrongfully condemned, from personal enmity. Accordingly, in the year 330, the emperor recalled *Arius* from exile, rescinded the decrees passed against his associates and friends, and permitted *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, the principal supporter of Arius, and his powerful faction, now thirsting for revenge, to persecute the defenders of the Nicene council.(30) They assailed no one more fiercely, than

(29) [the word *ὁμοούσιος* (*of the same essence*), in particular, was not agreeable to all. At first seventeen bishops hesitated to subscribe the creed and the condemnation of *Arius*, because they wished to shun the appearance of favoring the Sabellian error; and they objected, that the word *ὁμοούσιος* had been disapproved of, in the time of *Paul* of Samosata. (*Socrates*, H. E. i. c. 8, 23 &c. *Basil. Ep.* 360.) And in fact, *Paul* of Samosata had abused the word *ὁμοούσιος* to controvert any other distinction between the Son or Word and the Father, except the difference of names and of external relations in reference to the divine manifestation. And though it be not fully proved that this term, in the Samosatian sense of it, was rejected by a council at Antioch in the year 269, (which decision at Antioch is pronounced fabulous, by *Dr. Feuerlein*, in his Dissert. on the question: *Dei filium patri esse ὁμοούσιος antiqui ecclesiae doctores in concilio Antiocheno utrum negaverint?* Gotting. 1755.) Yet it is certain, that the Arians had before alledged this Antiochian decree, and no one had charged them with mistake in so doing. Nevertheless, those who were not pleased with the creed were generally brought to acquiesce in it, partly by the threats of the emperor, to banish all who would not subscribe, and partly by the advice of the princess *Constantia*. Only *Arius*, with the bishops *Theonas* and *Secundus*, persevered in a refusal. Yet some, [namely *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, and *Theognis* bishop of Nice,] subscribed only the creed itself, and not also the anathema. *Schl.*]

(30) [So sudden a change was not to be expected. The council of Nice had taken every precaution to prevent the further spread of Arianism; and its decrees had been approved by other councils in distant provinces, and thus had obtained the authority of decrees by the whole church. The emperor had superadded to the sentence of the bishops civil penalties, ordering the recusants into exile; and had condemned the writings of *Arius* to the flames, and commanded them to be delivered up on pain of death. [See the emperor's Letter to the bishops and people, in *Socrates*, H. E. i. 9.] Thus the Arian party seemed to be wholly suppressed. But it only seemed to be so. Four years after, the atmosphere about the court of *Constantine*, at once became clear and serene to the Arians; and the causes of so great a change are not well known; for the history of *Constantine* here has a chasm of three years. The princess *Constantia* seems actually to have had a hand in this great revolution. The bishops who were favorably disposed towards *Arius*, had recommended themselves to her, by giving back in the Nicene council, and subscribing the creed, very much, in compliance with her recommendation. (*Philostorgius*, H. E. i. c. 9.) This attention shown her, would naturally pave the way for them to the confidence of the princess. And therefore the statement of *Socrates* (L. i. c. 25.) and *Sozomen* (L. iii. c. 19.) is not improbable; namely, that it was by her, and by an Arian priest whom she at her death recommended to him, that *Constantine* was brought to entertain more favorable views of the Arians. At the instigation of this priest, the emperor dispatched a gracious letter to *Arius*, bidding him come to the court

Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria. When he could in no way be brought to restore *Arius* to his former honors and ecclesiastical standing, *Athanasius* was first deprived of his office, in a council held at Tyre AD. 335, and then banished to Gaul; while in the same year, by a numerous council held at Jerusalem, *Arius* and his friends were solemnly admitted to the communion of the church. But by none of these proceedings could the Alexandrians be induced to receive *Arius* among their presbyters. Accordingly the emperor called him to Constantinople, in the year 336, and ordered *Alexander*, the bishop of that city, to open the doors of his church to him. But before that could take place, *Arius* died at Constantinople, in a tragical manner.(31) And the emperor himself closed life shortly after.

Arius hastened to Constantinople, with his friend *Euzoius*; and was graciously listened to by the emperor, whom he satisfied as to his orthodoxy. At the requisition of the emperor, they both presented a confession of their faith, which was so artfully drawn up, as to conceal their real sentiments under orthodox phraseology. In this way *Arius* obtained permission to return to Alexandria. Antecedently to this, *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, and *Theognis* bishop of Nice, had obtained complete reinstatement in their offices; and the former now commenced persecuting the orthodox party, and especially *Athanasius*. The deposition of *Athanasius* was decreed by the council of Tyre; but his banishment was by order of the emperor, before whom he was accused of threatening to prevent the exportation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople. As *Arius* met with more opposition at Alexandria than he expected, and as his presence there caused commotions which seemed almost to amount to an insurrection; he was called back to Constantinople. Here he had another hearing before the emperor, and swore to a formula of faith presented by himself, which sounded very orthodox. The emperor was so well satisfied by this exhibition of *Arius*, that he sent for *Alexander* the bishop of Constantinople, and earnestly enjoined upon him to admit *Arius* the next Sunday to his communion. The terrified bishop retired to the church of St. Irene, and there prayed that the calamity might be averted. On the day appointed, *Arius*, accompanied by *Eusebius* of Nicomedia and others of his adherents, proceeded through the principal streets of the city, in order to enter the church in triumph, and entertained his friends with playful discourse. But as he passed along, the calls of nature obliged him to step aside. He entered one of the public offices erected for such purposes, and left his servants waiting at the door; and here he died with a violent colic. See *Dr. Walch's Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 486 &c. *Schl.*]

(31) Some of the moderns are disposed to call in question this account of *Arius'* death; but without good reason, since it is attested by such unexceptionable witnesses as *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Athanasius*, and others. Yet the cause of his sudden and extraordinary death—for the miserable man is said to have discharged his own bowels—is a subject of much controversy. The ancients, who tell us that God, being moved by the prayers of holy men, miraculously avenged the wickedness of the man, will hardly find credit at this day among candid persons well acquainted with Arian affairs. When I consider all the circumstances of the case, I confess, that to me it appears most probable, the unhappy man lost his life by the machinations of his enemies, being destroyed by poison. An indiscreet and blind zeal in religion has, in every age, led on to many crimes worse than this. [“The preceding account of *Arius'* death, and of the circumstances attending it, is given by *Athanasius*, (Ep. ad Serapion, de morte Arii, p. 522 &c. Opp. tom. ii. ed. Commelin,) by *Socrates*, (Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 37, 38,) *Sozomen*, (Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 29, 30.) by *Theodoret*, (Hist. Eccles. L. i. c. 15.) and by several other writers of the fourth century. The first in this list, and with him most of the others, draw a frightful picture of the manner of *Arius'* death, making him to have died by the falling out of all his bowels. Most of them regard it as a miracle, by which God punished him for his perjury, or hearkened to the

§ 14. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, one of his sons *Constantius*, the emperor of the East, with his wife and his court, was very partial to the Arian cause: but *Constantine* and *Constans* supported, in the western parts, where they governed, the decisions of the Nicene council. Hence the broils, the commotions, the plots, the injuries, had neither measure nor bounds, and on both sides councils were assembled to oppose councils. *Constans* died in the year 350; and two years after, a great part of the West, particularly Italy and Rome, came under the dominion of his brother *Constantius*; and this revolution was most disastrous to the friends of the Nicene council. For this emperor, being devoted to the Arians, involved them in numerous evils and calamities, and by threats and punishments, compelled many of them, and among others, as is well attested, the Roman pontiff *Liberius*, to apostatize to that sect to which he was himself attached.(32) The Nicene party made no hesitation to return the same treatment, as soon as time, place, and opportunity were afforded them. And the history of christianity under *Constantius*,

prayers of bishop *Alexander*, who with others returned thanks to God for this deliverance. It is not strange, that some moderns have moved the question, whether this whole narration, the chief source of which is found in the writings of the most strenuous opposer of *Arius*, and which respects a man then very much hated, may not be a fabrication. Yet the story is told with such uniformity as to the principal facts, by those who differ in the minor circumstances of it; and the spot where he died was so generally pointed out even in the fifth century, according to *Soerates*, that we are not authorized to doubt the truth of the general statement. Yet it can by no means be proved, or indeed be made to appear probable, that the sudden death of *Arius* was miraculous, and a punishment inflicted by God. *Sozomen* himself tells us, that some at the time regarded it as the consequence of a disease, which directly affected the heart; others believed, that his sudden joy at finding his affairs issuing so happily, brought on him this speedy death. Very much is requisite to justify the ascription of an event, which may be explained by natural causes, to a supernatural, and to the hand of God inflicting a divine punishment. But under such circumstances, christians have in all ages been too ready to make up such inconsiderate judgments. Besides, the death of *Arius* is painted as being as extraordinary as possible; and is not obscurely compared, by *Athanasius* in particular, with that of *Judas* the traitor; and on the other hand, the strange prayer of bishop *Alexander* against him, is not only passed without censure, but is represented as being a holy prayer which Heaven answered. The adherents of *Arius* maintained, that his enemies compassed his death by magical arts: and in very recent times, discerning writers have conjectured that he was poisoned. This however is merely a conjecture, and one which is often made on occasion of the sudden and unexpected death of persons who had many or powerful enemies. Nothing more, therefore, can be regarded as certain, but this; *Arius* died a sudden death; but the cause of it is unknown.' Translated from *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. v. p. 386, 387. Tr.]

(32) [It appears from the Letters of *Liberius*, which are still extant, and from the testimony of *Hilary* of Poitiers, *Jerome*, and others, that *Liberius* boldly resisted the Arians, and was therefore banished to Beroea in Thrace; that, at the end of two years, his eagerness to return to his bishoprick, led him to consent to the condemnation of *Athanasius*, and to subscribe the Arian creed set forth by the third council of Sirmium. This weakness in a Roman bishop has furnished the Protestants with an argument against the Catholic doctrine of papal infallibility, which they have not failed to urge successfully, and to the great annoyance of the Catholics. See, among others, *Bower's* *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 136 &c. Tr.]

presents the picture of a most stormy period, and of a war among brethren, which was carried on without religion or justice or humanity.(33)

§ 15. On the death of *Constantius*, in the year 362, the prosperous days of the Arians were at an end. *Julian* had no partialities for either, and therefore patronized neither the Arians nor the orthodox.(34) *Jovian* [AD. 363—364,] espoused the orthodox sentiments: and therefore all the West, with no small part of the East, rejecting Arian views, reverted to the doctrines of the Nicene council.(35) But the scene was changed under the two brothers, *Valentinian* [in the West], and *Valens* [in the East], who were advanced to the government of the empire in the year 364. *Valentinian* adhered to the decisions at Nice; and therefore, in the West, the Arian sect, a few churches excepted, was wholly extirpated. *Valens*, on the contrary, took sides with the Arians; and hence in the eastern provinces, many calamities befel the orthodox.(36) But when this emperor had fallen in a war with the Goths, AD. 378, *Gratian* [who succeed-

(33) [The Orthodox and the Arians were constantly in the field, and they often came to bloodshed. The imperial brothers frequently patched up an external peace with each other; but the christians who, from the principles of their holy religion, should have been united in the closest bonds of brotherhood and in unbroken peace, were engaged in unceasing war during the reign of these emperors. The victorious party oppressed the vanquished with false accusations, banishments, deprivations of office, anathemas of councils, artifice and violence. For proof, the reader is referred to *Athanasius*, Apolog. ad. Constant. p. 307 &c. *Historia Arianor.* ad Monach. p. 373 &c. 393 &c. *Sozomen*, H. E. Lib. iv. c. 9, 19. *Socrates*, H. E. Lib. ii. c. 37. and the dark picture of the state of the church, by *Vincentius Lerinensis*, in his *Commonit.* c. 6. *Schl.*]

(34) [*Julian*, who wished to make himself popular, and to ruin the christian church by its internal contests, not only gave all sects of christians entire liberty of conscience, but recalled all the banished. And this was greatly for the advantage of the orthodox, especially in the West, where the churches again recovered their bishops, and such of them as had renounced orthodoxy through fear, returned again to the profession of it. *Schl.*]

(35) The Arians in the East took great pains to draw *Jovian* over to their side; but as these attempts proved fruitless, various individuals of them, and in particular *Acacius*, were induced to yield assent to the Nicene creed. The Arians of Alexandria also in vain labored to bring *Athanasius* into disgrace; and he was in high favor, till the emperor's death. *Schl.*]

(36) [The persecution of *Valens* extended, not only to the orthodox, but also to the *Semi-Arians*, and other minor parties: and the *Semi-Arians*, after much negotiation, resorted to the unexpected measure of sending messengers to Rome, and by subscribing to the Nicene creed, attempted to form a coalition with the occidental christians. But this coalition was frustrated, partly by the repugnance of some of the *Semi-Arians* to the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and partly by the exertions of the powerful Arians at court; and a new persecution ensued. The orthodox ventured to make a representation to the emperor *Valens*, and for this purpose sent a delegation composed of 80 clergymen, to the court at Nicomedia. The emperor cruelly ordered *Modestus* the praetorian prefect, to put them all to death, but without noise; which he accomplished by putting them on board a vessel, and when at sea, causing the vessel and all the unhappy men to be burnt. Such cruelty, perhaps, is without a parallel among the persecutions by the pagans. See *Socrates*, H. E. iv. c. 15. *Sozomen*, H. E. vi. c. 13. *Theodoret*, H. E. iv. c. 21. and Dr. *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 543. &c. *Schl.*]

ed *Valentinian* in the West, in the year 376, and became master of the whole empire in 378,] restored peace to the orthodox.(37) After him, *Theodosius* the Great, [AD. 383—395,] by depriving the Arians of all their churches, and enacting severe laws against them,(38) caused the decisions of the Nicene council to triumph every where, and none could any longer publicly profess Arian doctrines, except among the barbarous nations, the Goths,(39) the Vandals,(40) and the Burgundians.(41) That there were great faults, on both sides, in this long and violent contest, no candid person can deny; but which party was guilty of the greatest wrong, it is difficult to say.(42)

(37) [*Gratian* granted religious freedom to all his subjects in the commencement of his reign, and excluded only the Manichaeans, the Photinians and the Eunomians from the liberty of holding assemblies for worship. He also recalled all the bishops, whom *Valens* had banished. Some of the Semi-Arians now again held their own synods, and renewed their confession of faith, that the Son is of like essence [*ὁμοιούσιος*] with the Father, in a council held at Antioch in Caria. On the other hand, the orthodox again set up public worship at Constantinople, and obtained the zealous *Gregory Nazianzen* for their bishop. *Gratian*, at length, forbid the assemblies of the heretics, without distinction. Codex Theodos. L. v. de Haeret. and the Notes of *Godefroi*, Tom. vi. p. 128. *Walch*, Hist. der Ketz. vol. ii. p. 547 &c. *Schl.*]

(38) See Codex Theodos. Tom. vi. p. 5, 10, 130, 146. and *Godefroi*, Notes on these laws. [See also *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 549 &c. *Schl.*]

(39) [The Goths were on this occasion entangled in the Arian heresy. Being driven by the Huns from their former residence on the Tanais, they sent an embassy to the emperor *Valens*, and obtained liberty to plant themselves on the banks of the Danube; promising, not only to serve the Romans in their wars, but to embrace the christian religion, as soon as teachers should be sent among them. *Ulphilas* was one of their ambassadors, who was himself an Arian, and *Valens* also gave him only Arian teachers for his assistants. It was not strange, therefore, that the Arian doctrine obtained so great currency among this people. The subsequent history of Arianism among them, is related by *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 553. *Schl.*]

(40) [Neither the time nor the circumstances, in which this people embraced christianity, can be ascertained. Only thus much is certain, that they were, in great measure, believers in christianity, before they came into France; (*Salvianus*, de Ira Dei, Lib. vii. p. 845 and 228.) And from a passage in *Jornandes*, (de Rebus Geticis, c. 25,) it is probable, that they got their first knowledge of christianity from their neighbors the Goths, and according to the Arian principles. They were persecutors of the orthodox; which can not be said of the Goths. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 559 &c. *Schl.*]

(41) [These first settled permanently in Gaul, during the next century, and there first embraced the christian religion, and according to the orthodox system. *Orosius*, Lib. viii. c. 32. and the history of the fifth century, infra, Pt. i. chap. i. § 4. But their intercourse with the neighboring Arians, the West Goths, infected them with the leaven of Arianism. Yet under the successors of their king *Gundebald*, the orthodox doctrine again got the upper hand; and under the domination of the Franks, the adherents to Arian principles were wholly rooted out. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii. p. 564 &c. *Schl.*]

(42) [The judgment pronounced by *Dr. Walch*, in the 2d vol. of his Historie der Ketzereyen, p. 698, is so sound and impartial, that I can not refrain from inserting it here without alteration. "The modern Arians in England blacken the character of *Athanasius* too much, in order to discredit his doctrine: other writers, too much prepossessed with the idea that a Kalendar saint must be an angel, represent this man and his adherents as absolutely faultless. If we would judge impartially, both parties were chargeable with the dreadful consequences of this

§ 16. The Arians would have done much more harm to the church, if they had not become divided among themselves, after the Nicene council, and split into sects which could not endure each other. The ancients enumerate as Arian sects, the *Semi-Arians*, the *Eusebians*,⁽⁴³⁾ the *Acetians*, the *Eunomians*, the *Acacians*,⁽⁴⁴⁾ the *Psathyrians*,⁽⁴⁵⁾ and others. But they may all be reduced to three classes. The first class embraces the old and *genuine Arians*; who, rejecting all new terms and modes of expression, taught explicitly, that the Son was *not begotten* by the Father, but *created* or formed out of nothing.⁽⁴⁶⁾ From these,

contest. There was a total want of moderation throughout: every where the mistaken notion reigned, that it is right to exercise control over the consciences of others; every where private matters were treated as public affairs of the church; every where the authority of ecclesiastical councils was misused; and still more, that of civil magistrates; every where, therefore, a persecuting spirit was cherished and maintained. In particular, we believe that these faults commenced on the side of the orthodox; that other bishops too hastily became linked in with *Alexander*; and that in the council of Sardica, too little respect was paid to the wishes of the oriental bishops in respect to *Athanasius*, which were that he might not sit and vote in the council, because he was the accused person. But the Arians were guilty of still greater offences. *Arius* was in fault, for so zealously endeavoring to create a party; but *Eusebius* of Nicomedia was, in our opinion, a real fire brand, who set the whole in a flame; and the suspicion, that pride and love of distinction led him to defend *Arius*, and produced that obstinacy in supporting the side he took, appears to us well founded. In short—this history very forcibly inculcates the necessity of uniting true benevolence to men, with our zeal for the truth, and the avoiding of all personal animosities, by presenting to us so many lamentable occurrences and so very unhappy consequences, arising from the neglect of these christian duties." *Walch*, ubi supra. *Schl.*]

(43) [These derived their name from two bishops named *Eusebius*, the one of Cesarea, and the father of church history, the other of Nicomedia, and afterwards of Constantinople, an intimate with *Constantine* the Great. These belonged to the class of *Semi-Arians*; called, at this day, *Subordinationists*, because they maintained a *subordination* among the persons of the Godhead. Yet this name was applied to all, who opposed the Nicene doctrine, and who disapproved either of the word ὁμοούσιος only, or also the idea it was used for. *Schl.*]

(44) [These bore the name of *Acacius*, a bishop of Cesarea, and successor of *Eusebius Pamphili*. He allowed that the Son was like the Father: but only in respect to his will. *Schl.*]

(45) [This word imports *pastry-cooks*; because a person of this occupation, a Syrian, named *Theoktistus*, was particularly zealous in defending one of the minor parties of Arians in Constantinople, which maintained that God the Father existed before the Son had a being. *Schl.*]

(46) [*Arius* maintained, there were *three* substances in God, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The *first* is the only eternal God. There is, absolutely, none like him; and his essence is incomprehensible. He is called the *Father*, in a sense corresponding with that in which the Son is called the *Son*; and as the latter was not always the Son, so the former was not always the Father. The *second* substance is the person, who is denominated in the scriptures, the Son, the Word, and the Wisdom of God. He is absolutely a *creature* of God; and one, whom God created, as he did the other creatures, immediately from nothing. This creation of the Son, the scriptures denominate a *generation*; and this creature is called the *Son* of God, in a figurative sense of the word, because God has *adopted* him. The terms *Word* and *Wisdom* of God, are ambiguous; for they sometimes denote certain powers or attributes of God, and sometimes a person, namely the Son. In the former acceptation, they are inherent in God, naturally and necessarily; but not so, in the latter acceptation. God, of his voluntary choice, produced this person, to be an instrument in his hand in the creation of the world. The Son, therefore is, in his essence, totally different from

deviated on the one side, the *Semi-Arians*; and on the other, the *Eunomians* or *Anomoeans*, that is, the disciples of *Eunomius*, a man of acuteness, and of *Aëtius*. The *former* maintained, that the Son of God was ὁμοούσιον, i. e. of *like essence*, with the father; yet not by nature, but only by grace. The leaders of this party were *George* of Laodicea, and *Basil* of Ancyra.(47) The *latter*, who were also called pure Arians, *Aëtians* (48) and *Exuconians*,(49) contended, that Christ was ἑτεροούσιον or ἀνόμοιον, i. e. *dissimilar*, both in *essence* and in other respects, to the Father.(50) Under each of these classes, there were other subordinate sects, whose subtleties and refinements have been but obscurely de-

the Father. As a rational creature, he possesses free will, is changeable, and so might become either vicious or virtuous; though by his diligence and his long practice, he has acquired permanent habits of virtue. And God has chosen for his Son, the most virtuous of all created spirits. Thus the Son, according to *Arius'* views, is not truly God, not eternal, not omniscient. There are, to his understanding, some mysteries; and he does not comprehend clearly the essence of the Father, nor his own nature. Yet God has graciously imparted to him pre-eminent gifts. Thereby he is become the Son of God; nay obtained for himself the name of *God*; though not in the proper sense of the word. Such is *Dr. Walch's* representation of the doctrine of *Arius*; in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 589 &c. *Schl.*]

(47) See *Prud. Maran*, Dissert. sur les Semi-Arians; which has been reprinted by *Joh. Voigt*, in *Biblioth. Haeresiolog.* tom. ii. p. 119 &c. [The Semi-Arians were also called *moderate Arians*; and *Eusebians*, because the *Eusebiuses*, especially the one of *Cesarea*, supported this party; and *Homoeousians*, from the word ὁμοούσιος, which was, as it were, their symbol.—*George* of Laodicea, was a native of *Alexandria*, and a very learned man. He had personal difficulties with bishop *Alexander*, and obtained the bishoprick of Laodicea, through the *Eusebian* party, to which he devoted himself. *Basil*, bishop of Ancyra, had the reputation of an upright and learned man, and was in great favor with the emperor *Constantius*. He can be taxed with no other fault, than that of not tolerating the word ὁμοούσιος. He drew on himself much persecution by his zealous opposition to *Photinus* and to the genuine Arians; and was deprived of his office by the *Acacians*. *Schl.*]

(48) [They had this name from their chief person, *Aëtius* of Antioch. This man applied himself to the sciences, at *Alexandria*, and acquainted himself with the medical art, as well as with theology. As all his instructors were of Arian sentiments, he also applied his talents and his dexterity in debate to the vindication of the Arian doctrines. He was made a deacon at Antioch; but the Semi-Arians and the orthodox hated him, and he was deposed and banished in the reign of *Constantius*. *Julian* recalled him, and gave him a bishoprick. He had the surname of the *Atheist*. *Socrates*, H. E. i. c. 35. *Sozomen*, H. E. iii. c. 15 &c. and iv. c. 23. *Schl.*]

(49) [This name is derived from the Greek words ἐξ ἑκ ὄντων. They said, that the Son of God might indeed be called *God*, and the *Word of God*; but only in a sense consistent with his having been brought forth ἐξ ἑκ ὄντων [from non-existences;] that is, that he was one of those things, which *once had no existence*; and of course, that he was properly a *creature*, and was once a *non-entity*. *Schl.*]

(50) See *Ja. Basnage*, Diss. de Eunomio, in *Henr. Canisius*, *Lectiones Antiquae*, tom. i. p. 172 &c. where are extant the creed and an apology of *Eunomius*. See also *Ja. Alb. Fabricius*, *Bibliotheca Gr.* vol. viii. p. 100—148. and *Codex Theodos.* Tom. vi. p. 147, 155, 157, 167, 200 &c. [*Eunomius*, a Cappadocian, was a scholar of *Aëtius*, and was made bishop of *Cyzicum* by his partizans. But he was soon displaced, and his whole life was full of unpleasant occurrences. He was peculiarly lucid in his style, and his writings are, on that account, the most valuable documents for the history of Arianism. *Schl.* See note, p. 299. *Tr.*]

veloped by the ancient writers. This discord among the Arians was as injurious to their cause, as the confutations and the zeal of the orthodox.

§ 17. Unhappily the Arian contests produced, as was very natural, some new sects. Some persons, while eager to avoid and to confute the opinions of *Arius*, fell into opinions equally dangerous. Others, after treading in the footsteps of *Arius*, ventured on far beyond him, and became still greater errorists. The human mind, weak, powerless, and subject to the control of the senses and the imagination, seldom exerts all its energies to comprehend divine subjects, in such a manner as to be duly guarded against extremes. To the former class, I would reckon *Apollinaris* the younger, bishop of Laodicea, though otherwise a man of great merit, and one who in various ways rendered important service to the church.(51) He manfully asserted the divinity of *Christ*, against the Arians; but by philosophizing too freely and too eagerly, he almost set aside the human nature of the Savior. He maintained, that *Christ* assumed only a human body, endowed with a sentient soul, but not possessed of intellect; and that the divine nature in *Christ* did the office of a rational soul or mind:(52) whence it seemed to follow, that the divine nature became mingled with the human,(53) and with the human nature suffered pain and death. This great man was led astray, not merely by the ardor of debate, but likewise by his immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine concerning a twofold soul; from which if the divines of that age had been free, they would have formed more wise and more correct judgments on many points. Some among the ancients attribute other errors besides this, to *Apollinaris*; but how

(51) [See a sketch of his life and writings, above, p. 297. note (29). Tr.]

(52) [*Apollinaris* believed that *Christ* had no need of a rational soul, because the divine nature was competent to all the rational and free acts which the Savior performed; and he could see no reason why *Christ* must have had *two* intelligent natures and two free wills. He supposed further, that a rational human soul, as it was the seat of sinful acts, was liable to moral changes; and therefore *Christ*, if he had possessed a rational human soul, could not have had an unchangeable, that is, a sinless, human nature. And he supported his opinion by the many passages of scripture which speak of *Christ*'s becoming man, in which only the word *σὰρξ*, *flesh* is used for the human nature; e. g. Joh. i. 14. These arguments needed an answer; but his opposers replied to them very imperfectly. They showed indeed, from the bible, that *Christ* had a rational human soul. But their proof was defective in this, that they did not show, that by the word *ψυχή*, in the scriptures, must necessarily be understood a *rational* soul. And what they brought forward besides this, were either the bad consequences that would follow, or occasions for logomachy, which rather retarded than furthered the discovery of truth. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 186 &c. Schl.]

(53) [This consequence, however, *Apollinaris* did not admit. He was indeed accused of denying the actual distinction of the two natures, and of holding to such a confusion of them, as *Eutiches* afterwards maintained. But he rejected the term *mixture*; and expressly taught, that he did not subvert the doctrine of two distinct natures in *Christ*, but that the divinity remained divine, and the flesh remained flesh. See *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 193 &c. Schl.]

much credit is due them, is doubtful.(54) The doctrine of *Apollinaris* met the approbation of many, in nearly all the eastern provinces; and being explained in different ways, it became the source of new sects. But as it was assailed by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of learned men, it gradually sunk under these united assaults.

§ 18. To the same class must be reckoned *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia;(55) if confidence may be placed in *Eusebius* of Cesarea, and in his other adversaries, who tell us, that he so explained the mystery of the holy Trinity, as to fall into the Sabellian and Samosaténian errors. Yet there are many who think, that both *Eusebius* of Nicomedia and *Eusebius* of Cesarea unfairly represent his sentiments, because he gave offence by the severity of his attacks upon the Arians and upon the bishops who favored them. But, admitting that his accusers were influenced in some respects by their hatred of the man, yet it is certain, that their accusations were not altogether groundless. For it appears, from a careful examination of the whole subject, that *Marcellus* considered the Son and the Holy Spirit as two *emanations* from

(54) See *Ja. Basnage*, *Historia haeresis Apollinaris*; which is republished with some learned additions, by *Jo. Voigt*, *Biblioth. Haeresiologica*, tom. i. Fascic. i. p. 1—96. See also *ibid.* tom. i. Fascic. iii. p. 607. The laws against the Apollinarians, are extant in the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 144 &c. See likewise (*Chaufepie*,) *Nouveau Dictionnaire hist. et. crit.* tom. i. p. 304 &c. ["See an account of *Apollinaris*, and his heresy, in the English edition of *Bayle's Dictionary*, at the article *Apollinaris*." *MacI.* Concerning this sect, *Dr. Walch* has treated most solidly, and with the application of impartial criticism, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 119—229. *Schl.*]

(55) [This *Marcellus* was a person of weight in the Nicene council, and there opposed the Arians with a zeal and energy, which procured him praise from his own party, and hatred and obloquy from the opposite side. (See *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxxii. c. 2. *Athanas.* *Apolog. contra Arian.* Tom. i. Pt. ii. p. 143, 150. and *Constantine*, *Epistt. Pontiff.* p. 379, 383.) *Asterius* a defender of the Arian doctrine, attacked him in writing, and accused him of Sabellianism. *Marcellus* in reply wrote a book to defend the true doctrine respecting the subordination of Jesus Christ to the Father. In the year 336, the Arian bishops assembled at Constantinople deposed him, as one convicted of the Sabellian or Samosaténian heresy, and elected *Basil* in his place. After the death of *Constantius*, he recovered his see; but lost it again almost immediately, as the Eusebians again got the ascendancy. He now fled to Rome, and exhibited a confession of his faith to the bishop *Julius*, by whom, with the other bishops of the Athanasian party assembled at Rome, he was recognized as orthodox, and as a sufferer for the truth. On the other hand, the eastern bishops persevered in their criminations of him. In the year 347, the western bishops at the council of Sardica, again pronounced him innocent. But when *Photinus*, a pupil of *Marcellus*, commenced his disturbance, *Athanasius* now first threw out some suspicions, that his doctrine was not pure; but he soon dropped them. *Basil* the Great, however, was more decided in his opposition to *Marcellus*, and held him to be actually a heretic. Yet he afterwards acknowledged himself in the wrong. *Marcellus* and his friends took pains to procure testimony, from influential men and from churches, to their orthodoxy; and they were not unsuccessful. *Marcellus* was, in reality, not without considerable learning; but his judgment was weak, and he had the habit of talking at random, and was at the same time very bitter against his antagonists. It is therefore, not only possible, but also very probable, that he often let drop faulty expressions, which in the view of his enemies contained dangerous errors. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 232 &c. *Schl.*]

the divine nature, which, after performing their respective offices, were to return back into the substance of the Father: and whoever believed so, could not, without self-contradiction, hold the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to differ from each other in the manner of distinct persons.(56) *Marcellus* increased the odium and suspicions against him, by refusing, in the last years of his life, to condemn *Photinus* his disciple.(57)

§ 19. At the head of those, whom the contests with *Arius* led into still greater errors, may undoubtedly be placed, *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium,(58) who in the year 343, advanced opinions concerning God, equally remote from those of the orthodox and those of the Arians. On well considering what the ancients have stated without much perspicuity or uniformity, it appears, that he supposed, *Jesus Christ* was born of the virgin *Mary*, by the Holy Spirit; that with this extraordinary man, a certain divine *emanation*, which he called the *Word*, became united; that, on account of this union of the *Word* with the man *Jesus*, he was called the *Son of God*, and also *God*; and that the Holy Spirit was a virtue or *energy*, proceeding from God, and not a *person*.(59)

(56) [It is nevertheless uncertain, whether *Marcellus* really denied the personal distinctions in the Trinity. The accusations of his opposers are not credible evidence in this case. *Marcellus* and his friends constantly denied that they were Sabellians. He denied indeed, that there were three ὑποστάσεις, affirming that there was but one ὑπόστασις. But this word had then so indeterminate a meaning, that nothing certain can be inferred from it. For it denoted, sometimes, what we should call *substance*; and at other times, was equivalent to *person*. *Dr. Walch*, ubi supra, p. 290, thinks it probable, as *Marcellus* always strenuously contended, and with justice, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are ἀδιασπέρως and ἀχωρίως (*inseparably*) united, he must have regarded the word ὑπόστασις, as equivalent to the phrase, ὑπόστασις δις ὧσα a *different substance*. Yet clearly he often used unsuitable descriptions and comparisons, respecting the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; and such as seem to shew, that he understood by these persons only certain attributes and acts of God. But perhaps these were only unfortunate expressions, or errors of the moment, from which he would give back, when the heat of contest subsided. *Schl.*]

(57) See *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, Diatribe de caussa Marcelli; in the Nova Collectio Patrum Graecor. Tom. ii. p. li. &c. [republished, with some notes, by *Voigt*, Biblioth. Haeresiolog. vol. i. Fascic. ii. p. 297. *Schl.*] and *Ja. Gervaise*, Vie de S. Epiphane, p. 42 &c. [Add also, *Walch*, Hist der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 229—299, and *Chr. Hen. Vogel's* Disputation at Gottingen 1757, de Marcello Ancyrae Episcopo. *Schl.*]

(58) [Yet *Photinus* was not a native of Sirmium, as some have supposed, being misled by a faulty Latin version of a passage in *Epiphanius*, de Haeres. lxxi. § 1. He was rather a Galatian, (*Jerome*, de Viris Illustr. c. 107. and *Socrates*, H. E. ii. c. 18.) and most probably of Ancyra. He was an author; but his writings are lost. And he was eloquent, and had an excellent faculty at securing the affections and making proselytes among his hearers. See *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 9 &c. *Schl.*]

(59) [To give a more distinct view of the opinions of *Photinus*, we will here state them, as they are arranged by *Dr. Walch*, Loc. cit. p. 34. *Photinus* had, (1.) erroneous views of the Trinity. On this subject, he taught thus: The holy scriptures speak indeed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but we are to understand by them, only *one person*, who in scripture is called the Father. What the scriptures call the *Word* of God, is by no means a substance or a *person*. Still less is it a person begotten by the Father, and therefore called the Son.

The temerity of the man was chastised, not only by the orthodox, in their councils of Antioch AD. 345, of Milan AD. 347, and of Sirmium,(60) but also by the Arians, in a council held at Sirmium AD. 351. He was deprived of his office, and died in exile in the year 372.(61)

§ 20. After him, *Macedonius*, bishop of Constantinople, a distinguished Semi-Arian teacher, being deprived of his office, through the influence of the Eunomians, by the council of Constantinople, in the year 360,(62) in his exile founded the sect of

[For with God there can be no generation ; and of course he can have no Son. Neither is the Word *that* person who made the world ; but the *Word* is properly the *understanding* of God ; which comprehends the designs of God in all his external operations, and is therefore called God. The Holy Spirit also is not a *person*, but an attribute of God. Hence followed (II.) erroneous ideas of the *person* of *Christ*. He maintained, that Jesus Christ was a *mere man* ; that before his birth, he had no existence, except in the divine foreknowledge ; and that he began to *be*, when he was born of Mary by the Holy Spirit. Yet he received the special influences of divine power, whereby he wrought miracles. This is the indwelling of the *Word*. On account of these excellent gifts and his perfect virtue, God took this man into the place of a son ; and therefore he is called the *Son of God*, and also *God*. Therefore it must be said, that the Son of God had a beginning. *Schl.*]

(60) [Concerning the time and succession of these councils, there has been much debate between *Petarius*, *Sirmond*, *la Roque*, and others ; of which an account is given by *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 5 &c. We will only add, in correction of *Dr. Mosheim's* statements ; 1st, that the earliest of these councils was held in the year 343 ; as appears from three documents, first brought to light by *Maffei* ; and 2ndly, that it was held by the *Semi-Arians*. So that the first orthodox council against *Photinus*, was that of *Milan*. In that of Sirmium, the eastern bishops were assembled ; and they pronounced *Photinus* a heretic. *Photinus* when adjudged to be deprived of his office and sent into exile, made application to the emperor, and obtained leave publicly to defend his doctrine. *Basil*, bishop of Ancyra, was appointed to dispute with him, and a formal discussion took place. Both parties became angry. But the victory was adjudged to *Basil* ; and the former decision was affirmed. See *Walch*, loc. cit. p. 51 &c. *Schl.*]

(61) *Matth. de la Roque*, de Photino, ejusque multiplici damnatione, Geneva, 1670. 8 vo. *Tho. Ittig*, Historia Photini ; in his Heptas Dissertationum, subjoined to his Diss. de Haeresiarchis aevi Apostolici. [We may add, *Petarius*, Diss. de Photino haeretico, ejusque damnatione ; in his Rationarium Temporum, 3d edit. and among the Opuscula of *Peter de Marca*, [vol. v. p. 183 &c. ed. Bamberg, 1789 ; where it is accompanied with the two Diatribae of *Sirmond*, respecting the councils of Sirmium ;] and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 1—70. *Schl.*]

(62) [There were several persons of the name of *Macedonius*, who should not be confounded with this man. The most noted of them were *Macedonius* of Mopsueste, a contemporary with our *Macedonius*, and also involved in the Arian contests : (*Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 19 :) and *Macedonius* bishop of Constantinople in the reign of the emperor Anastasius [AD. 491—518,] by whom he was banished for his zeal against the Eutycheans. The election of our *Macedonius* was attended with disorders which merit notice. This metropolis had one *Paul* for its bishop, who was deposed by the emperor *Constantius*, and *Eusebius* of Nicomedia chosen in his place. After the death of *Eusebius*, the orthodox replaced *Paul* in his office ; but the Eusebian bishops appointed *Macedonius*. The emperor *Constantius* was displeased with the movement of the orthodox, and ordered his general, *Hermogenes*, to drive *Paul* from the city. And as his adherents made opposition, and the general had to use force, there was a general insurrection, which cost both sides much blood. The orthodox populace set fire to the general's house, and dragged him about the streets, with a rope around

the *Pneumatomachi*. For he now openly professed, what he had before concealed, that the *Holy Spirit* is a *divine energy* diffused throughout the universe, and not a *person* distinct from the Father and the Son.(63) This doctrine was embraced by many in the Asiatic provinces. But the council of Constantinople, assembled by *Theodosius* the Great, in the year 381, and which is com-

his neck, and finally killed him. The emperor now came himself to Constantinople, drove *Paul* from the city, and punished the people. And he also refused to establish *Macedonius* in the office, because he had given occasion to the bloodshed : but he allowed him to remain in the city, and to hold worship in one of the churches which was assigned him. (*Socrates*, H. E. ii. c. 13. and *Sozomen*, H. E. iii. c. 8.) *Paul* returned again to Constantinople, and was again chased away by the soldiery ; and on the other hand, *Macedonius* was, in the year 342, reinstated by an imperial general ; which occasioned another massacre, in which more than 3000 persons lost their lives. But as *Constantius* was compelled by his brother *Constans*, to reinstate the orthodox bishops ; *Paul* shared in this good fortune, and *Macedonius* with his adherents had to content themselves with a single church to worship in. After the death of *Constans*, *Paul* was again displaced, and *Macedonius* once more seated in the episcopal chair. Here, confiding in the protection of the emperor, he stirred up a general persecution against the adherents to the Nicene creed, which extended to the provinces adjacent to Constantinople. (*Socrates*, H. E. ii. c. 26, 27, 38. and *Sozomen*, H. E. iv. c. 20, 26.) In the year 356, that church at Constantinople, in which was placed the coffin of *Constantine* the Great, seemed ready to fall down ; and *Macedonius* therefore would remove the coffin. Some, including the orthodox party, maintained that this removal was improper and irregular ; being influenced partly by respect for the deceased emperor, and partly by hatred against *Macedonius*. But as *Macedonius*, notwithstanding, had proceeded to the removal, and had brought the coffin into another church ; the two parties came to blows in the latter church, and such a slaughter was there made, that the porch was filled with dead bodies. This unfortunate step drew upon *Macedonius* the emperor's displeasure. (*Socrates*, H. E. ii. c. 38. *Sozomen*, H. E. iv. c. 21.) About this time, the disagreement among the opposers of the Nicene faith, came to an open rupture ; and *Basil* of Ancyra, the leader of the Semi-Arians, drew *Macedonius* over to his party. (*Philostorgius*, Hist. Eccles. iv. c. 9.) From this time onward, *Macedonius* held a high rank among the Semi-Arians, and supported their cause in the council of Seleucia. But he thus drew on himself such hatred from the whole Arian party, that they, in the year 360, with *Acacius* and *Eudoxius* at their head, deprived him of his office at Constantinople. *Macedonius* was very restless under this, and labored to establish the Semi-Arians, by defending their opinions ; and this gave occasion for the Semi-Arians to be sometimes called *Macedonians*. He died soon afterwards. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 74 &c. *Schl.*]

(63) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 4. [For a more full exhibition of the Macedonian doctrines, we will subjoin the statement of *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit. p. 96. As to their doctrine concerning the *Son of God*, some Macedonians agreed with the adherents to the Nicene fathers ; but others, and among them *Macedonius* himself, coincided with the mildest form of the Semi-Arian creed. In regard to the *Holy Spirit*, they departed wholly from the opinions of the orthodox. Some indeed did not declare themselves, in regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. They did not expressly deny that he was God ; and yet they hesitated to affirm it. And this was no unusual thing. Even *Basil* the Great, would not recommend to have the name of *God* used in public of the Holy Spirit, nor condemn those who refused thus to use it. Nor would *Gregory* disapprove this. See *Petavius*, Dogm. Theolog. Lib. i. de Trinitate, c. 10. Tom. ii. p. 45, 64. and *Semler*, Einleitung zum 3ten Theil der *Baumgartens* Polemik, p. 173, 183. Others who did declare themselves, affirmed that the Holy Spirit was not a *person* in the Godhead : that he was not, what the Father and the Son are ; and therefore no divine honors were due to him. Some held the Holy Spirit to be a creature ; and therefore did not deny his personality. Others denied his personality, and regarded him as a mere attribute of God. *Schl.*]

monly considered as the *second oecumenical* council, early dissipated by its authority this young and immature sect. One hundred and fifty bishops present in this council, defined fully and perfectly the doctrine of three persons in one God, as it is still professed by the great body of christians, which the Nicene council had only in part performed. They also anathematized all the heresies then known ; assigned to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the grandeur of the city over which he presided, a rank next after the bishop of Rome ; and made such other regulations as the general interests of the church seemed to require. (64)

§ 21. The phrenzy of the ancient Gnostics, which had been so often confuted, revived again in Spain. In the beginning of this century, one *Mark*, a native of Memphis, introduced it from Egypt, and communicated it first to a few individuals. It had proceeded considerable lengths, and had infected some persons in reputation for their learning and piety, when *Priscillian*, a man of birth, fortune, and eloquence, and afterwards bishop of Avila, imbibed it. Being accused by some bishops before the emperor *Gratian*, *Priscillian* and his followers were banished from Spain : but he returned soon after. Accused again, in the year 384, before *Maximus* (the usurper in Gaul, after the assassination of *Gratian*) he was condemned, with several of his associates, and executed at Treves, in the year 385. The instigators of this

(64) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. v. c. 8. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 7. [The Macedonians led an externally good and strict life : and by promoting monkery, obtained such reputation for piety, agreeably to the taste of that age, as contributed much to their popularity in Constantinople and its vicinity. After their separation from the Arians, and after their attempt to unite themselves with the orthodox had failed, they spread themselves considerably, especially in Thrace, along the Hellespont, and in Phrygia. In the western provinces they were not found. At Constantinople, they had their own churches and bishops. Among the attempts to reclaim the Macedonians from their errors, the most noticeable was that of the second general council at Constantinople. The emperor *Theodosius* hoped they might be won over, more readily than the Arians, because they differed less from the orthodox. He therefore called Macedonian bishops to the council. There were 36 of them present ; and much pains was taken to persuade them to embrace the Nicene decisions. But all efforts were vain ; they declared, that they would sooner embrace the Arian, than the Nicene faith. And hence their doctrine was opposed in this synod, by an addition made to the Nicene creed, and by expressed forms of condemnation. With these ecclesiastical weapons against the Macedonians, worldly ones were combined. In the statutes of the elder *Theodosius*, (Lib. xi, xii, xiii. Codicis Theodos. de Hæreticis,) they are mentioned by name ; and in those of the younger *Theodosius*, which are inserted in the Codex Theodosianus, (Lib. lix, lx, lxxv.) it will be seen, that they still existed, but could hold worship only in the principal cities. These civil regulations gave the ill-disposed bishops too much liberty to manifest their persecuting spirit towards the Macedonians, and enabled them wholly to exterminate them, it would seem, under these emperors. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 70—118 ; and, respecting the council of Constantinople, his Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 224 &c. The decrees of this council, are given in *Beveridge's* Pandecta Canonum, Tom. i. p. 85. *Schl.*—The first decree respects the creed, and anathemas ; the second, confines bishops to their provinces ; the third, gives the bishop of Constantinople the rank of *second patriarch*. The four remaining decrees are of less importance. Tr.]

capital execution for heresy, were however, regarded with abhorrence by the bishops of Gaul and Italy : for it was not yet regarded among christians as a pious and righteous act, to deliver heretics over to the civil power to be punished.(65) *Priscillian* being slain, his opinions were not at once suppressed, but spread far and wide in Spain and Gaul : and even in the sixth century,

(65) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Hist. Sacra, L. ii. c. 46, 51. and Dialog. iii. de Vita Martini, c. 15. [*Priscillian* had ability to present his doctrine with so much dexterity and eloquence, that he gained many friends both among the high and the low ; and his sentiments were soon spread through all Spain. Among his adherents there were some bishops, particularly *Instantius* and *Salvianus*, and many ladies of respectability. *Hyginus*, bishop of Corduba, who afterwards went over to the Priscillianists, was the first to oppose his doctrine ; and for this purpose made a representation of it to *Idacius* the bishop of Merida, who by his rash violence against bishop *Instantius*, blew the fire of the Priscillianist war into a great flame. After many and long contests, a council was held at Saragossa in 380, at which the Priscillianist doctrine was condemned, and the bishop *Instantius* and *Salvianus*, with the laymen *Elpidius* and *Priscillian*, were excommunicated. This measure rendered the sect more resolute and determined ; and *Priscillian*, that he might be more safe, was raised by the party from a layman to a bishop of Avila.—The civil power was put in motion against the sect ; and *Idacius* obtained from the emperor *Gratian* a decree, by which this sect, as well as others, was banished the country. This decree depressed them for a time. The leaders of the party took their course towards Rome ; and while passing through France, they seduced many, especially in Aquitain Gaul. Although they got no hearing at Rome, yet they found means to obtain a rescript from *Gratian*, by which the former decree was repealed, and these bishops were restored again to their offices. When *Maximus* had seized the government, he issued, at the instigation of *Idacius*, a command to the Priscillianist teachers, to appear before the ecclesiastical council of Bourdeaux. Here *Instantius*, who readily and frankly answered the interrogatories of the council, was deposed : but *Priscillian* appealed to the emperor. Bishop *Martin* of Tours, saw with concern, a civil Judge about to pass sentence in an ecclesiastical affair, and made representation on the subject to the emperor, who assured him that no blood should be shed. Yet the emperor was finally persuaded by some bishops, to commit the investigation of the subject to his minister of state, *Evodius*, a stern Judge. He at Treves, in the year 385, put *Priscillian* to the rack, and extorted from him a confession that he had uttered impure principles, had held nocturnal meetings with base females, and prayed naked ; and after the facts had been reported to the emperor, *Priscillian* and some of his adherents were put to death, and others were punished with banishment. This is the first instance of a criminal prosecution for heresy. The Priscillianists regarded these executions as a martyrdom ; while their opposers sought in this bloody way to exterminate them ; and the emperor had it in contemplation to send military officers into Spain, with full power to search out the heretics, and deprive them of life and property. But here again bishop *Martin* showed himself in an amiable light. He repaired to Treves, and there made such representations, as prevented the execution of the emperor's designs. Yet the people shed the blood of heretics, in many places ; and some bishops had such unchristian minds, as to approve of it. Yet others, on the contrary, disapproved of it ; and had great dissension with the former, in regard to it. The Priscillianists, however, still continued to be numerous in Spain, especially in Galicia ; and in the fifth century, when the irruption of the barbarians into Spain, threw the ecclesiastical affairs into great disorder, it afforded this sect opportunity again to spread itself very much. And in the sixth century, *Aguirre* has inserted in the Concil. Hispan. tom. ii. p. 269 &c. a letter of *Montanus* bishop of Toledo, in the year 527, from which it appears, that many persons of this sect then lived in Valencia : and in the year 561, a council was held against them, at Braga. From this time onwards, no more is heard of them ; and they must either have gradually wasted away, or have fallen at once on the irruption of the Saracens. See Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 387—430. Schl.]

the *Priscillianists* caused much trouble to the bishops of those provinces.

§ 22. The doctrines of the Priscillianists, no one of the ancients has accurately described: on the contrary, some of them have perplexed and obscured the subject. It appears however, from authentic records, that the Priscillianists came very near, in their views, to the Manichaeans. For they denied the *reality* of Christ's birth and incarnation; maintained, that the visible universe was not the production of God, but of some demon or evil principle; preached the existence of *Aeons* or *emanations* from God; declared human bodies to be prisons for celestial minds, fabricated by the author of evil; condemned marriages; denied the resurrection of the body, &c. Their rules of life were very severe: for what many state concerning their flagitious and libidinous practices, rests on no credible testimony. That the Priscillianists used dissimulation, and eluded their enemies by deceiving them, is true; but that they regarded all kinds of lying and perjury as lawful, as is commonly reported of them, has not even the appearance of truth.(66)

(66) See *Simon de Vries*, Diss. critica de Priscillianistis, Trajecti 1745, 4to. in which the principal fault is, that he follows too closely *Beausobre's* History of the Manichees, taking every thing there asserted to be true. *Fran. Girresii* Historia Priscillianistarum chronologica, Romae 1750. 8vo. In *Angeli Calogerae* Opusculi scientifici tom. xxvii. p. 61 &c. occurs: *Bacharius illustratus*, seu de Priscilliana haeresi Diss. which however is less occupied in illustrating the affairs of the Priscillianists, than [the work of] *Bacharius*, [a learned Spaniard, who composed a short treatise *de Fide*, first published by *Muratori*, (Anecdota Latino-rum, tom. ii.) and which, some consider as a polemic tract, against the Priscillianists. To these, must be added, *Walch*, loc. cit. p. 378—481.—To ascertain the real doctrines of the Priscillianists, is very difficult, and perhaps, impossible. The quotation from an epistle of *Priscillian*, which *Orosius* has preserved, (in his *Commonitorium*; inter Opp. *Augustini*, tom. viii. p. 431.) is so obscure, that it would be very natural to suppose, his contemporaries did not correctly understand him. Hence we cannot rely entirely on the testimony of the ancients, even if they appear to have been impartial writers. Still it appears unquestionable, that *Priscillian* embraced *Gnostic* and *Manichaean* errors; that he misconstrued the scriptures, and perverted them by allegorical interpretations; that he relied on apocryphal books, as of divine authority; that he believed in the eternity of matter, and held that the evil angels were not creatures of God; that he also believed the world was not the work of God, and that all changes in the material universe originated from the evil spirits. Concerning the soul, he taught that it is a particle of the divine nature, separated from the substance of God. The human body, as all other flesh, according to the Priscillianistic doctrine, came from the devil. And even the production of man, by the union of a soul with a body, was the work of evil spirits. They believed in an unconditional necessity for the changes a man undergoes, and which they ascribed to the influence of the stars. They denied the personal distinction of the three persons in the Godhead. It is very probable, that they controverted the *human* nature of Christ; and it is still more probable, that they denied him a *real body*, than that they denied him a *human soul*. From these principles, it would follow, that they did not believe in a resurrection of the body. The same principles led them to disapprove of marriage, and of the procreation of children; and to forbid the eating of flesh. Their moral principles were, in general, strict, and tended to produce an ascetic life. And on this account, the accusation of shameless debauchery, brought against them by their adversaries, is very improbable. Whether

§ 23. To these larger sects, certain minor ones may be added. One *Audaeus*, an honest man, and ejected from the church in Syria, for too freely reproving the corrupt lives of the clergy, collected a congregation and became its bishop. Being banished by the emperor into Scythia, he went among the Goths, and there propagated his sect with good success. As to the time when this sect arose, the ancients are not agreed. In some of their institutions, they deviated from other christians; among which peculiarities, this is especially noticed by the ancients, that, contrary to the decree of the Nicene council, they celebrated the feast of Easter on the same day with the Jewish Passover. They are said, moreover, to have attributed to the Deity a human form; and to have held some other opinions which were erroneous. (67)

§ 24. To this century, also, the Greeks and orientals refer the

they all held prevarication, lying, and perjury, to be allowable, even in cases where one's religion is to be avowed, is uncertain. Yet it is very certain, that some of them held this dangerous principle; as for instance, *Dictinnius*, from whose book *Augustine* quotes the arguments used to justify lying, which he also confutes, in his book de Mendacio, ad Consent. Yet that *Priscillian* and his first set of followers did not think so, appears from their suffering martyrdom. *Schl.*]

(67) *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxx. p. 811. *Augustine*, de Haeres. cap. L. *Theodoret*, Fabul. Haeret. Lib. iv. c. 9. *Joach. Schröder*, Diss. de Audaeanis; which is in *Joh. Voigt*, Bibliotheca Historiae Haeresial. tom. i. P. iii. p. 578. [and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 300—321.—The founder of this sect, is called both *Audius* and *Audacus*; and his followers are likewise called both *Audiani* and *Audaeani*; and not unfrequently *Anthropomorphites*, because they were taxed with attributing to God a human form. *Audius* was of Mesopotamia; and stood in high estimation among the Syrians, on account of his holy life, and his great zeal for the honor of God. The last was so great, that he publicly punished his own brother, and would not flatter the avaricious and luxurious bishops: and for this he endured persecution, hatred, and reproach. But he was undismayed, and bore it all with patience. Yet when at last the hatred of his enemies went so far as often to beat him and his friends, he separated himself from the church, (though, previously, some had refused him communion,) formed a party, and got himself ordained its bishop. This step made the separation complete; for it was contrary to all ecclesiastical rules, which required at least *three* bishops to solemnize an ordination, and also forbid the ordination of any schismatical bishop. The orthodox bishops entered a complaint against him before the emperor, who banished him at an advanced age, into Scythia. This occasioned his going among the Goths, and converting many of that nation to christianity. He erected monasteries among them, recommended the monastic life, ordained bishops; and died before the general persecution by *Athanasius*. *Audaeus* held a few errors. He believed that God possessed, not a perfect human *body*, but a human *shape*, and of course the form of human *limbs*; and that the fashion of the human body was copied from the divine shape to which the scriptural term, *image of God*, is to be referred. In regard to their worship, his followers were strict *separatists*; and would not worship at all with those christians, who were of an irreligious life, or who held church communion with the irreligious. Nay, they discarded the name of *christians*, for that of *Audians*; because many of them had abused the name of *christians*, in order to secure their safety. In regard to the feast of Easter, they were *Quartodecimarians*; that is, they kept this festival at the time the Jews did; and defended the practice, by appealing to the Apostolical Constitutions. They held apocryphal books, and had their own system of church discipline. In general, it may be said, they were rather *fanatics*, than proper heretics. Their errors were proof, rather of a weak head, than of a perverse heart; and their defence of their errors and contempt for other christians were the effects of their [religious or] fanatical pride. *Schl.*]

origin of the sect called *Messalians* and *Euchites*: and indeed clear traces of them first appear in the latter part of this century; though their principles were much more ancient, and were known before the christian era, in Syria, Egypt, and other countries of the East. These persons, who lived secluded from intercourse with the world, in the manner of monks, derived their name from their *praying*. For they believed, that an evil demon naturally dwells in the mind of every man, which can be expelled no otherwise than by continual praying and singing: and this demon being once expelled, the soul will return to God pure, and be again united to the divine essence, of which it is a fraction. To this leading principle, they added, as may readily be supposed, many other strange notions, closely allied to the sentiments of the Minichaeans, and derived from the same source from which the Manichaeans derived their doctrines, namely, the oriental philosophy.(68) In short, the Euchites were a sort of

(68) *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxxx. p. 1067. *Theodoret*, Haeret. Fabul. Lib. iv. c. 10. *Timotheus* Presbyter, de Receptione Haereticor. in *Joh. Bapt. Cotelier's* Monumenta eccles. Graecae, Tom. iii. p. 403 &c. *Ja. Tollius*, Insignia Itineris Italici, p. 110 &c. *Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana, Tom. i. p. 128. Tom. iii. P. ii. p. 172 &c. and others: [in particular, *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii. p. 481—536. The names *Messalians* and *Euchites* signify *prayers* or *praying brethren*. The first is Syriac, [a participle, from the root ܡܥܠ , *oravit*,] and the latter is Greek, [*Ευχίται*, or *Ευχῆται* from *εὐχή* *oratio*. See *Suicer*, Thesaur. Eccles. Tom. i. p. 1235 &c. and *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles. iv. c. ii. Tr.] They were so called, because they believed the essence of religion to consist in prayer; that is, in that tranquil state of mind, in which a person neither thinks, nor has volitions. They were also called *Enthusiasts*, because they pretended to be inspired and to hold converse with the Holy Spirit; *Choreutae* (*χορευταί*, *dancers*), from this motion of their bodies, which they commonly used; the *Spiritual ενσωματιστοί*), which was the name they gave to themselves; also *Lampetians*, *Adelphians*, and *Marcianists*, from certain of their leaders. There were both pagan and christian Messalians. The former acknowledged indeed a plurality of gods; yet they worshipped but *one*, whom they called *ὁ παντοκράτωρ* the *Almighty*. These were more ancient than the christians, built houses for worship similar to the christian churches, and assembled morning and evening, with torches and candles, and employed their time in praising God; whence they were called *Euphemites*. The christian Messalians were so named from the coincidence of their practice with that of the pagans: they seem to be the offspring of monkish enthusiasm, and to have first appeared in Mesopotamia, and thence to have spread into Syria; but their origin cannot be traced with more particularity. They seem not to have been a party, who had determinate, fixed, principles of faith, peculiar to themselves. Their number also, appears never to have been great. They were all *ascetics*, though they were not all *monks*, in the proper sense of the word. Their religious theory was founded on an impure *mysticism*, like to what is common to nearly all fanatical persons and communities, and which originated, like the system of *Manes*, from the principles of the oriental philosophy. Yet the Messalians, like all enthusiasts, appear to have relied more upon spirits, apparitions, and revelations, than upon the oriental system of metaphysics. Their principles did not necessarily lead to vicious conduct; yet they might afford occasion for practising vice. And in fact, there were among them many vicious persons, whom idleness and spiritual pride led into gross offences. And there were not wanting among them real villains, who abused the mystical stupidity of others, to subserve their own wicked purposes. Heretics, in the strict sense, they were not; although led astray by their pernicious mystecisms, they

mystics, who imagined, according to the oriental notion, that two souls resided in man, the one *good* and the other *evil*; and who labored to expedite the return of the former to God, by contemplation and prayer. This sect drew over many to its ranks, by its outward shew of piety: and the Greeks waged war with it, through all the subsequent centuries. Yet it should be remembered, that the names *Messalians* and *Euchites* were used with great latitude, among the Greeks and the orientals; and were applied to all, who endeavored to raise the soul to God, by recalling it from all influence of the senses; though these persons often differed very materially in their religious opinions.

§ 25. Towards the close of this century, Arabia and the adjacent countries were disturbed by two opposite sects, the *Antidico-Marianites* and the *Collyridians*. The former contended, that the virgin *Mary* did not remain always a virgin; but that she had intercourse with her husband, *Joseph*, after the birth of our Savior. The latter, whom the ladies especially favored, went to the opposite extreme: they worshipped *St. Mary* as a goddess, and thought she ought to be honored and appeased with libations, sacrifices, and offerings of *cakes* [*κολλυρίδες*, in Latin *collyridae*.](69) The more obscure and unimportant sects, I pass without notice.

embraced wrong fundamental principles in regard to practical and experimental religion; and actuated by these, they at least in part, fell into heretical opinions. *Schl.*]

(69) See *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxxviii. lxxix. p. 1033, and 1057. [Among the moderns, *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 577 &c. *Dr. Walch* makes mention, (loc. cit. p. 598.) of one *Bonosus*; concerning whom he also published a dissertation, at Gottingen, 1754. *de Bonoso haeretico*. This *Bonosus* was, probably, bp. of Sardica in Illyricum, near the end of this century. He was accused of maintaining, that *Mary* did not always remain a virgin, but bore several children. And this charge seems not to have been a false one. But whether *Bonosus* denied also the divinity of Christ, and taught that he was the Son of God only by adoption, is very dubious. Yet so much is certain, that in the fifth and sixth centuries, there were opposers of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the divinity of Christ, who in France and Spain were known by the names of *Bonosians*. But still, it is uncertain whether they derived the name from this, or from some other *Bonosus*. The reader may consult *Ittig's Supplementum operum Clementis Alexandrini*; where, in the annexed Fascic. *Observat. miscellan. ad His. Eccles.* p. 242. there is an Essay, *de Haeresi Bonosi*.—The *Collyridianae* (for *Epiphanius* makes them all females) were women, who carried their respect for the mother of Jesus so high, that they were justly charged by the orthodox fathers with superstition and idolatry. They came from Thrace, and the yet more distant regions of Scythia, into Arabia. It was their practice to dress out a car, or a square throne (*κρίνον*), spread over it a linen cloth, and on a clear day, once a year, place on it during the day a loaf of bread, or a *cake* (*κολλυρίς*), which they offered to the virgin *Mary*. *Dr. Mosheim* (in his *Lectures*) considered them as a set of simple persons, who had considerable heathenism about them; and supposed this offering of a cake was derived from paganism. While they were mere pagans, they were accustomed to bake and present to the goddess *Venus*, or *Astarte* (the Moon,) certain cakes which were called *collyrides*. And when they became christians, they thought this honor might now be best shown to *Mary*. The doctor had in his eye, perhaps, a passage in *Jeremiah* (viii. 18.) where the prophet speaks of such a sort of worship: and in general, it is well known, that the offering of cakes in the pagan worship, was a customary thing. See *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit. p. 625 &c. and *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir à l' Histoire Eccles.* Tome xii. p. 83. *Schl.*]

CENTURY FIFTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. State of the Roman empire.—§ 2. Farther decline of idolatry.—§ 3. Nations converted to christianity.—§ 4. Conversion of the German nations.—§ 5. The Franks.—§ 6. The Irish.—§ 7. Causes of these conversions.

§ 1. To understand the causes of events affecting the condition of christians in this century, it is necessary to keep in view some part of the civil history of the period. We shall therefore first observe concisely, that the Roman empire at the commencement of this century, was divided into two parts, one of which embraced the eastern, and the other the western provinces. *Arcadius*, the emperor of the East, resided at Constantinople. *Honorius*, who governed the West, lived at Ravenna in Italy. The latter, distinguished by nothing but the mildness of his disposition, was negligent of the affairs of the empire. Hence the Goths first laid waste Italy, several times, and plundered Rome in a distressing manner. And this first defeat of the Romans, was followed by others still more grievous, under the succeeding emperors. For the ferocious and warlike people of Germany overran those fairest provinces of Europe, Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and set up new kingdoms in them. At last the Heruli, in the year 476, under *Odoacer* their chief, having vanquished *Romulus Augustus*, who is commonly called *Augustulus*, overturned the empire of the West, and brought Italy under their subjection. Sixteen years after, *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths inhabiting Illyricum, invaded these unwelcome intruders, by the authority of the Greek emperor, and vanquished them; in consequence of which, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths was established in Italy, in the year

493, and continued with various fortune, till the year 552.(1) These new kings of the West professed to respect the authority of the emperors resident at Constantinople, whom they acknowledged as sovereigns over them; but in reality, they were quite independent, and especially *Theodoric* in Italy, a man of distinguished abilities, and left nothing to the emperors but the shadow of supremacy.(2)

§ 2. Amidst these wars, and the dreadful calamities they produced, the cause of christianity suffered much. Yet the christian emperors, especially those of the East, continued their efforts to extirpate what remained of the ancient idolatry. In particular, *Theodosius* the younger [AD. 408—450.] has left us striking proofs of his zeal in this matter; for we have still extant various laws of his, requiring the idolatrous temples to be utterly destroyed, or to be dedicated to *Christ* and the saints, abrogating the pagan ceremonies and rites, and excluding the adherents to paganism from all public offices.(3) Yet in the western parts, the efforts of this kind were somewhat less; and we therefore find the Saturnalia, the Lupercalia, the gladiatorial shows, and other idolatrous customs observed with impunity, both at Rome and in the provinces, and men of the highest rank and authority publicly professing the religion of their ancestors.(4) But by degrees, this liberty was confined to narrower limits, and those spectacles which were most inconsistent with the sanctity of the christian religion, were every where suppressed.(5)

§ 3. The limits of the christian church were extended, both in the East and in the West, among the tribes addicted to idolatry.

(1) For a fuller account, see the Abbe *de Bos*, *Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoise* tom. i. p. 558 &c. and *Jos. Ja. Mascov's* History of the Germans, written in German. [Also *Edw. Gibbon's* History of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 29—31, 33—36. Tr.]

(2) *Car. du Fresne*, Diss. xxiii. ad Histor. Ludovici S. p. 280. *Muratori*, Antiqu. Ital. tom. ii, p. 578, 832. and Annal. Italiae: *Giannone*, Histoire de Naples, tom. i. p. 207. *Joh. Cochlæi* Vita Theodorici Ostrogothorum regis, with the observations of *Joh. Peringskiöld*, Stockholm 1699. 4to.

(3) See Codex Theodos. tom. vi. p. 327, 331, &c.

(4) See *Macrobius*, Saturnalia; in particular, Lib. ii. p. 190. ed. Gronovii: *Scipio Maffei*, delli Anfiteatri, Lib. i. p. 56, 57. *Pierre le Brun*, Histoire critique des pratiques superstitieuses, tom. i. p. 237. and others; but especially *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, Diss. de moribus tempore Theodosii M. et Arcadii ex Chrysostomo; which is found in Latin, in the Opp. Chrysostomi, tom. xi. and in French, in the Memoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres, tom. xx. p. 197 &c. [The pagans traced the calamities of the empire to the prevalence of christianity. Therefore in the year 408, at the instigation of the Tuscan soothsayers, idolatrous sacrifices were again established at Rome, in order to procure success against Alaric: and the existing bishop, *Innocentius*, who was apprised of the measure, allowed it to take place, if we may believe *Zosimus*, on condition that the sacrifices should be offered without noise. See *Zosimus*, Lib. v. cap. 41. To confute this accusation of the populace against christianity, was the design of *Augustine's* twenty two Books de Civitate Dei, addressed to Marcellus. Schl.]

(5) Near the close of the century, *Anastasius* in the East, prohibited the combats with wild beasts, and the other shows. See *Jos. Simon Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. tom. i. p. 268, 272.

mountains, Libanus and
 Stylites, of whom we shall
 Simeon told them, that their
 ancient superstitions, and to em-
 These mountaineers obeyed the counsel of
 they saw the wild
 The
 if the writers tell us the truth. The
 any
 christian wor-
 Jews,
 by one *Moses* of
 voluntarily embraced
 § 4. The German nations, who rent in pieces the western Ro-
 man empire, were either christians before that event, as the Goths
 and others, or they embraced christianity after establishing their
 kingdoms, in order to reign more securely among the christians.
 But at what time, and by whose instrumentality, the Vandals, the
 Suevi, the Alans, and some others became christians, is still un-
 certain, and is likely to remain so. As to the Burgundians, who
 dwelt along the Rhine, and thence passed into Gaul, it appears
 from *Socrates*, (8) that they voluntarily became christians, near the

(6) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i. p. 246 &c.

(7) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 38. [where the account, in brief, is, that
 in the time of *Theodosius* the younger, an impostor arose, called *Moses* Cretensis.
 He pretended to be a second *Moses*, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete,
 and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They
 assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a prom-
 ontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of
 them obeyed and perished in the waters, and many were taken up and saved by
 fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces;
 but he escaped them, and was seen no more. Likewise in the island of *Minorca*,
 many persons abandoned Judaism. Yet their conversion does no great honor to
 the christians; for it was in consequence of great violence done to the Jews, of
 levelling their synagogue with the ground, and taking away their sacred books.
 See the account of their conversion, by the bishop of the Balearian islands: *Seve-
 rus*, Epist. encycl. de Judaeorum in hac insula conversione et de miraculis ibi-
 dem factis; published from a M. S. in the Vatican library, by *Baronius*, in his
Annales Eccles. AD. 418. and abridged by *Fleury*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, Liv. xxiv.
 Yet it is certain, that the Jews even in that age often imposed on the christians,
 by pretending to have favorable views of christianity. This appears from the
Codex Theodos. Lib. xvi. Tit. 8. Leg. 23. and *Socrates*, (Hist. Eccles. L. viii. c.
 17.) mentions a Jew, who received baptism, with a considerable sum of money,
 successively from the orthodox, from the Arians, and from the Macedonians, and
 finally applying to the Novations for baptism, was detected by the miracle of the
 disappearance of the water from the font. Although this miracle may be doubt-
 ed, and the impostor may have been detected by an artifice of the Novatian bish-
 op, yet it appears from the story, that what is practiced by many Jews at the
 present day, is no new thing. *Schl.*]

(8) Hist. Eccles. Lib. vii. c. 30. [They applied to a bishop in Gaul, who di-
 rected them to fast seven days, and baptized them on the eighth. *Dr. Semler*,
 (in his Hist. Eccles. Selecta Capita, tom. i. p. 203,) supposes this event took place
 about the year 415. And in this year it was, according to the Chronicon of *Prosper*,

commencement of the century. Their motive to this step, was the hope that *Christ*, or the God of the Romans, who they were informed was immensely powerful, would protect them from the incursions and the ravages of the Hunns. They afterwards joined the Arian party, to which also the Vandals, Suevi, and Goths were addicted. All these warlike nations measured the excellence of a religion, by the military successes of its adherents, and esteemed *that* as the best religion, the professors of which were most victorious over their enemies. While therefore they saw the Romans possessing a greater empire than other nations, they viewed *Christ*, the God of the Romans, as the most worthy of their homage.

§ 5. It was this motive which produced the conversion of *Clovis* [*Chlodovaeus*, *Hludovicus*, *Ludovicus*,] or *Lewis*, king of the *Salii*, (a tribe of the Franks,) who conquered a large part of Gaul, and there founded the kingdom of the Franks, which he endeavored to extend over all the Gallic provinces; a bold, cruel, barbarous, selfish and haughty prince. For in the year 496, in a battle with the Allemanni at Tolbiacum,(9) when his situation was almost desperate, he implored the aid of *Christ*, whom his wife *Clotildis*, a christian and daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had long recommended to him in vain; and he made a vow, that he would worship *Christ* as his God, provided he obtained the victory. Having become victorious, he stood to his promise, and in the close of that year was baptized at Rheims.(10) Some thousands of Franks followed the example of their king. It has been supposed, that, besides the exhortations of his wife, the expectation of an extension of his dominions, contributed to induce him to renounce idolatry for christianity; and it is certain, that his professing christianity, was very subservient to the establishment and enlargement of his kingdom. The miracles reported on this occasion, are unworthy of credit; in particular, that greatest of them, the descent of a dove from heaven with a phial full of oil, at the baptism of *Clovis*, is either a fiction, or, as I think more probable, a *deception* craftily contrived for the occasion.(11) For

that the Burgundians took possession of a part of Gaul on the Rhine, with the consent of the Romans and their confederates, having promised to embrace christianity. *Schl.*]

(9) [*"Tolbiacum* is thought to be the present *Zulpick*, which is about 12 miles from Cologn." *Macl.*]

(10) See *Gregory* of Tours, *Historia Francor.* L. ii. c. 30, 31. *Henry Count de Bunau*, *Historia imperii Romano-Germanici*, Tom. i. p. 588 &c. *Abbe de Bos*, *Histoire critique de la monarchie Françoise*, Tom. ii. p. 340 &c. [and *J. G. Walch*, *Diss. de Clodovaeo M. ex rationibus politicis Christiano*, Jena 1751. *Schl.*—*Clovis*, once hearing a pathetic discourse on the sufferings of *Christ*, exclaimed: *Si ego ibidem cum Francis meis fuissem, injurias ejus vindicarem; Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged his wrongs.* See *Fredigarius*, *Epitom.* c. 21. *Aimoin*, L. i. c. 16. and *Chronicon St. Dionysii*, L. i. c. 20. *Tr.*]

(11) Against this miracle of the phial, *Joh. Jac. Chiflet* composed his book, *de Ampulla Rhemensi*, Antw. 1651. Fol. The reality of the miracle is defended,

such pious frauds were much resorted to in that age, both in Gaul and Spain, in order to captivate more readily the minds of the barbarous nations. It is said, that the conversion of *Clovis* gave rise to the custom of addressing the French monarchs, with the titles of *most Christian Majesty*, and, *Eldest Son of the Church* : (12) for the kings of the other barbarous nations which occupied the Roman provinces, were still addicted to idolatry, or involved in the errors of Arianism.

§ 6. *Coelestine*, bishop of Rome, sent into Ireland to spread christianity among the barbarians of that island, in the first place, *Palladius*, whose labors were not crowned with much success. After his death, *Coelestine* sent *Succathus*, a Scotchman, whose name he changed to *Patricius* [*Patrick*,] into Ireland, in the year 432 ; a man of vigor, and as appears from the event, not unfit for such an undertaking. He was far more successful in his attacks upon idolatry ; and having converted many of the Irish to christianity, he in the year 472 established at *Armagh* the see of an archbishop of Ireland. (13) Hence *St. Patricius*, although there

among many others, by the *Abbe Vertot*, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscript. et des belles lettres*, Tom. iv. p. 350 &c. After considering all the circumstances, I dare not call the fact in question. But I suppose, *St. Remigius*, in order to confirm the wavering mind of the barbarous and savage king, artfully contrived to have a dove let down from the roof of the church bearing a phial of oil, at the time of the king's baptism. Similar miracles occur in the monuments of this age.—[The possibility of the event, is made conceivable in this way. Yet there still remain weighty historical objections to the reality of the fact. The story rests solely on the authority of *Hincmar*, a writer who lived 300 years after the time. *Aritus*, *Anastasius*, and even *Gregory* of Tours, and *Fredegarius* are wholly silent on the subject. Besides, *Hincmar's* narrative contains the improbable circumstance, that the clergy who should have brought the oil that was wanting, could not get near the font, on account of the pressure of the crowd ; but as anointing with oil was then practised at every person's baptism, it is improbable that on so solemn an occasion as this, due preparation for this part of the service would have been neglected. *Schl.*]

(12) See *Gabr. Daniel's* and the *Abbe de Camp's* Diss. de titulo Regis Christianissimi ; in the *Journal des Scavans*, for the year 1720, p. 243, 404—448, 536. *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, Tome xx. p. 466 &c.

(13) See the *Acta Sanctorum*, Tom. ii. Martii p. 517. Tom. iii. Februar. p. 131, 179 &c. *Jac. Waræus*, *Hibernia Sacra*, p. 1 &c. Dublin 1717. Fol. The same *Ware* published the *Opuscula Sti. Patricii*, with notes, London 1656. 8vo. The *synods* held by *St. Patrick*, are given by *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ*, Tom. i. p. 2 &c. [and thence republished in *Harduin's* Collection. Tom. i. p. 1790 &c.] Concerning the famous cave, called *the purgatory of St. Patrick*, see *Peter le Brun*, *Histoire critique des pratiques superstitieuses*, Tome iv. p. 34 &c. [A full account of *St. Patrick* and his labors in Ireland, is given by archbishop *Usher*, *Ecclesiæ Britannicæ Primordia*, cap. xvii. p. 815 &c. *Tr. Rapin de Thoyras*, in his *History of England*, (Tom. i. B. ii. p.) remarks, that there were *three* *Patricii* or *Patricks*. (1) The *elder*, who died in the year 449, mentioned in the *Chronicle of Glastenbury*. (2) The *great*, who died in 493, after governing the Irish church for 60 years ; he is the one mentioned by *Mosheim*. (3) The *younger*, who was a nephew of *Patrick the Great*, and survived his uncle some years. From his writings it appears, that *St. Patrick* was one of the most skilful men of the age in converting the heathen : yet that he used unsuitable means to convert them, namely fear, threatenings, and fictitious wonders or prodigies. The Irish still shew the cave, which is called *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, in which he shut up gross transgressors to be punished. In-

were some christians in Ireland before his day, has been justly called the *Apostle of Ireland*, and the father of the Irish church, and is held in high veneration to this day.

§ 7. The causes, which induced all these pagan nations to abandon the religion of their ancestors and profess christianity, may be gathered from what has been already said. He must lack discernment, who can deny that the labors, the perils, and the zeal of great and excellent men, dispelled the clouds of darkness from the minds of many; and on the other hand, he must be short-sighted, and not well versed in the history of this age, who cannot see, that the fear of the vengeance of man, the hope of temporal advantages and honors, and the desire of obtaining aid from christians against their enemies, were prevalent motives with many to abandon their gods. How much influence *miracles* may have had, it is difficult to say. For I can easily believe, that God was sometimes present with those pious and good men, who endeavored to instil the principles of true religion into 'the minds of barbarous nations :'(14) and yet it is certain, that the greatest part of the prodigies of this age are very suspicious. The greater the simplicity and credulity of the multitude, the more audacious would the crafty be in playing off their tricks :(15) nor could the more discerning expose their cunning artifices, with safety to their own lives and worldly comfort.(16) It is commonly the case, that when great danger attends the avowal of the truth, then the prudent keep silence, the multitude believe without reason, and the architects of imposition triumph.

closed in the cavern (which is 16 1-2 feet long, two feet wide, and not high enough for a man to stand in erect, and situated on an island 126 yards long, by 44 broad, in lake *Derg*, county of *Donnegal*, *Tr.*) the culprits were exposed to distressing terrors, and reported that they saw infernal spirits, and various terrific objects. The Englishmen who have visited the cave in modern times, could find nothing there to excite their fears. It appears therefore, that the terror was produced by artifices. The cavern had certain holes, by which fire might be thrown into it. And the wild Irishmen, believing that the torments they were to endure there were inflicted by the devil, were put into so great fear that they dared not commit any gross offences. *Schl.*]

(14) There is a remarkable passage, concerning the miracles of this century, in the *Theophrastus*, seu de Immortalitate animae, of the acute *Aeneas Gaza*, p. 78. ed. Barthii. Some of these miracles, he tells us, he himself had witnessed. p. 80, 81.

(15) The Benedictine Monks speak out freely on this subject, in the *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 33. It is a fine saying of *Livy*, *Histor. Lib. xxiv. c. 10. § 6.* Prodigia multa nuntiata sunt, quae quo magis credebant simplices ac religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur.

(16) *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial. i. p. 438. Ep. i. p. 457. Dial. iii. cap. ii. p. 487.*

CHAPTER II.

THE CALAMITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The evils suffered by the christians in the Roman empire.—§ 2. Attempts of the pagans against them.—§ 3. Their persecutions.—§ 4. In Persia.—§ 5. Individual enemies of christianity.

§ 1. It has been already observed, that the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Hunns, the Vandals, and other fierce and warlike nations, who were for the most part pagans, had invaded and miserably rent asunder the Roman empire. During these commotions, the christians at first suffered extremely. These nations were, it is true, more anxious after plunder and dominion, than for the propagation of the false religions of their ancestors; and therefore did not form any set purpose to exterminate christianity; yet the worshippers of idols, who still existed every where scattered over the empire, neglected no means to inflame the barbarians with hatred against the christians, hoping by their means to regain their former liberty. Their expectations were disappointed, for the greatest part of the barbarians soon became christians themselves; yet the followers of *Christ* had every where first to undergo great calamities.

§ 2. The friends of the old religion, in order to excite in the people the more hatred against the christians, while the public calamities were daily increasing, renewed the obsolete complaint of their ancestors; That all things went well before *Christ* came; that since he had been every where embraced, the neglected and despised gods had let in evils of every kind upon the world. This weak attack was repulsed by *Augustine*, in his *Books on the city of God*, a copious work, and full of erudition. He also prompted *Orosius* to write his *Books of history*, in order to shew that the same, and even greater calamities and plagues afflicted mankind, before the christian religion was published to the world. In Gaul the calamities of the times drove many to such madness, that they wholly excluded God from the government of the world, and denied his providence over human affairs. These were vigorously assailed by *Salvian*, in his *Books on the government of God*.

§ 3. But the persecutions of the christians deserve to be more particularly noticed. In *Gaul* and the neighboring provinces, the Goths and Vandals, who at first trampled under foot all the rights both of God and man, are reported to have laid violent hands on innumerable christians. In *Britain*, after the fall of the Roman power in that country, the inhabitants were miserably harrassed by the neighboring Picts and Scots who were barbarians. There-

fore, having suffered various calamities, they in the year 445 chose *Vortigern* for their king; and he, finding his forces inadequate to repel the assaults of the enemy, in the year 449, called the Anglo-Saxons from Germany to his aid. But these, having landed troops in Britain, produced far greater evils to the inhabitants than they endured before; for these Saxons subdued the people whom they came to assist, and endeavored to reduce the whole country to subjection to themselves. This produced an obstinate and bloody war between the Britons and the Saxons, which continued with various fortune during 130 years, till the Britons were compelled to yield to the Anglo-Saxons, and take refuge in Batavia and Cambria [the modern Holland and Wales.] During these conflicts, the condition of the British church was deplorable; for the Anglo-Saxons, who worshipped exclusively the gods of their ancestors, almost wholly prostrated it, and put a multitude of christians to a cruel death.(1)

§ 4. In *Persia*, the christians suffered grievously, in consequence of the rash zeal of *Abdas* bishop of Suza, who demolished the *Pyraeum*, a temple dedicated to fire. For being commanded by the king, *Isdegerdes*, to rebuild it, he refused to comply; for which he was put to death, in the year 414, and the churches of the christians were levelled to the ground. Yet this conflict seems to have been of short duration. Afterwards, *Vararanes* the son of *Isdegerdes*, in the year 421, attacked the christians with greater cruelty, being urged to it, partly by the instigation of the Magi, and partly by his hatred of the Romans, with whom he was engaged in war. For as often as the Persians and Romans waged war with each other, the christians resident in Persia were exposed to the rage of their monarchs; because they were suspected, and perhaps not without reason, to be favorably disposed towards the Romans, and to betray their country to them.(2) A vast number of christians perished under various exquisite tortures during this persecution.(3) But their tranquil-

(1) See *Beda* and *Gildas*, among the ancients; and among the moderns, *Ja. Usher*, *Britannicar. Ecclesiar. Antiquitates*, cap. xii. p. 415 &c. and *Rapin Thoiras*, *History of Engl.* Vol. i. B. ii. p. &c. [The Saxons were not directly persecutors of the christians, but only involved them in the common calamities of their slaughtered and oppressed countrymen. Tr.]

(2) *Theodoret*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. v. c. 39. [where is a full account of the conduct of *Abdas*, and of the sufferings of the christians during the persecution. Tr.] *Bayle*, *Dictionaire historique*; article *Abdas*, vol. i. p. 10. *Barbeyrac*, *de la morale des Peres*, p. 320. [An account of the manner in which christianity obtained free toleration, and an extensive spread, in Persia, at the commencement of this century, through the influence of *Maruthas*, a bishop of Mesopotamia, who was twice an ambassador to the court of Persia; is given by *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. vii. c. 8. Tr.]

(3) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental Vaticana*, tom. i. p. 182, 248. [See also *Theodoret*, as above. The most distinguished sufferers in this persecution, were *Abdas* the bishop of Suza; *Hormisdas*, a Persian nobleman, and son of a provincial governor; *Benjamin*, a deacon; *James*, who apostatized, but repented; and *Severus*, who possessed a 1000 slaves. Tr.]

lity was restored, when peace returned between Vararanes and the Romans, in the year 427.(4) The Jews also, who were opulent and in good credit in various parts of the East, harrassed and oppressed the christians, every way they were able.(5) None of them was more troublesome and overbearing, than *Gamaliel* their patriarch, who possessed vast power among the Jews; and whom therefore, *Theodosius* Junior restrained by a special edict, in the year 415. (6)

§ 5. So far as can be learned at this day, no one ventured to write books against christianity and its adherents, during the fifth century; unless perhaps, the Histories of *Olympiodorus*(7) and of *Zosimus*,(8) are to be considered of this character, the latter of whom is frequently sarcastic and uncandid, and does injustice to the christians. Yet no one can entertain a doubt, that the philosophers and rhetoricians, who still kept up their schools in Greece, Syria, and Egypt, secretly endeavored to corrupt the minds of the youth, and labored to instil into them at least some of the principles of the proscribed superstition.(9) The history of those times, and the writings of several of the Fathers, exhibit many traces of such clandestine machinations.

(4) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 20.

(5) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. V. c. 23, and 16; and *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 265 &c.

(6) In the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 262 &c.

(7) *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. lxxx p. 178. [*Olympiodorus* was a native of Thebes in Egypt, a poet, historian, and an ambassador to the king of the Hunns. He flourished about the year 425; and wrote *Historiarum Libri xxii*, addressed to *Theodosius* Junior, and containing the Roman history, particularly of the West, from AD. 407 to 425. The work is lost, except the copious extracts preserved by *Photius*, ubi supra. Tr.]

(8) [*Zosimus* was a public officer in the reign of *Theodosius* Junior, and wrote *Historiarum Libri vi.* in a neat Greek style. The first book gives a concise history of Roman affairs, from Augustus to Diocletian; the following Books are a full Roman history, down to AD. 410. The best editions are, by *Cellarius*, Jena 1728. 8vo. and by *Reitemier*, Lips. 1784. 8vo. Tr.]

(9) *Zacharias Mitylen.* de Opificio Dei, p. 165, 200. ed. Barthii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. State of learning among christians.—§ 2. In the West.—§ 3. State of philosophy in the West.—§ 4. In the East.—§ 5. The younger Platonists.—§ 6. Aristolean philosophy revived.

§ 1. Although the illiterate had access to every office both civil and ecclesiastical, yet most of the persons of much consideration were persuaded, that the liberal arts and sciences were of great use to mankind. Hence public schools(1) were kept up in the larger cities, as Constantinople, Rome, Marseilles, Edessa, Nisibis,(2) Carthage, Lyons, and Treves; and masters competent to teach youth were maintained at the expense of the emperors. Some of the bishops and monks also of this century, here and there, imparted to young men what learning they possessed.(3) Yet the infelicity of the times, the incursions of barbarous nations, and the penury of great geniuses, prevented either the church or the state from reaping such advantages from the efforts to promote learning, as were desired by those engaged in them.

§ 2. In the western provinces, especially in Gaul, there were some men of learning, who might have served as patterns for others to follow. Such, among others, were *Macrobius*, *Salvian*, *Vincentius* of Lirins, *Ennodius*, *Sidonius Apollinaris*, *Clau-*

(1) [The history and progress of schools among christians, are the subject of an appropriate work, by *Geo. Gottl. Reufel*, Helmst. 1743. 8vo. *Schl.*]

(2) [The schools at *Edessa* and *Nisibis*, are noticed by *Valesius*, on *Theodori Lectoris*, Hist. Eccl. L. ii. p. 164. b. *Schl.*]

(3) [On the episcopal and cloister schools, in Africa, Spain, Italy, and Gaul, remarks are made by *Ludov. Thomasinus*, de *Disciplina Ecclesiae*, tom. i. Pt. ii. Lib. ii. p. 27 &c. *Schl.*]

dianus Mamertus, and *Dracontius*; who were writers, not equal indeed to the ancient Latin authors, yet neither altogether destitute of elegance, and who devoted themselves to the study of antiquities and other branches of learning. But the barbarians who laid waste or took possession of the Roman provinces, choked these surviving plants of a better age. For all these nations considered arms and military courage as the only source of all glory and virtue; and therefore despised learning and the arts. Hence wherever they planted themselves, there barbarism insensibly sprung up and flourished, and the pursuit of learning was abandoned exclusively to the priests and monks. And these, surrounded by bad examples and living in the midst of wars and perils, gradually lost all relish for solid learning and praise, and substituted in place of it a sickly spectre, and an empty shadow of erudition. In their schools, the boys and youth were taught *the seven liberal arts*; (4) which being comprised in a few precepts, and those very dry and jejune, as appears from the treatises of *Augustine* upon them, were rather calculated to burden the memory, than to strengthen the judgment and improve the intellectual powers. In the close of this century, therefore, learning was almost extinct; only a faint shadow of it remained.

§ 3. Those who thought it expedient to study philosophy,—and there were but few who thought so,—did not in this age commit themselves to the guidance of *Aristotle*. He was regarded as too austere a master, and one who carried men along a thorny path. (5) Perhaps more would have relished him, had they been able to read and understand him. But the system of *Plato* had for several ages been better known; and it was supposed, not only to be less difficult of comprehension, but to accord better with the principles of religion. Besides, the principal works of *Plato* were then extant in the Latin translations of *Victorinus*. (6) Therefore, such among the Latins as had a taste for philosophical inquiries, contented themselves with the decisions of *Plato*; as will appear to any one who shall only read *Sidonius Apollinaris*. (7)

§ 4. The state of learning among the Greeks and the people of the East, both as respects elegant literature and the severer sciences, was a little better; so that among them may be found a larger number of writers, who exhibit some marks of genius and erudition. Those who prosecuted the science of jurisprudence, resorted much to *Berytus* in Phenicia, where was a celebrated

(4) [These comprised I. the *Trivium*, namely Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic; and II. the *Quadrivium*, or Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy. See below, Century xi. Pt. ii. ch. i. § 5. Tr.]

(5) Passages from ancient writers in proof, are collected by *Joh Launoi*, de *varia Aristotelis fortuna in Academia Parisiensi*.

(6) See *Augustine*, *Confessionum* Lib. i. c. 2. § 1. Opp. Tom. i. p. 105, 106.

(7) See his *Epistles*, Lib. 4. Ep. iii, xi. and Lib. iv. Ep. ix, and others.

law school,(8) and to Alexandria.(9) The students in physic and chemistry resorted also to Alexandria. The teachers of eloquence, poetry, philosophy, and the other arts, opened schools almost every where; and yet the teachers at Alexandria, Constantinople, and Edessa, were supposed to excel the others in learning and in the art of instructing.(10)

§ 5. The sect of the younger Platonists sustained itself, and its philosophy, at Athens, at Alexandria, and in Syria, with no small share of its ancient dignity and reputation. *Olympiodorus*,(11) *Hera*,(12) and other men of high reputation, adorned the school of Alexandria. At Athens, *Plutarch*,(13) and his successor *Syrianus*,(14) with *Theophrastus*, procured for themselves fame and distinction. From them *Proclus* received instruction, and became the prince of the Platonists of this century, and acquired for himself and for the species of wisdom which he professed so much celebrity among the Greeks, that he seems almost the second father of the system.(15) His disciples, *Marinus* of Neapolis, *Ammonius* the son of Hermias, *Isidorus*, *Damascinus*, and others, followed eagerly in the footsteps of their instructor, and left many followers who copied their example. Yet the laws of the emperors, and the continual advances of christianity, gradually diminished very much the fame and the influence of these philosophers.(16) And as there was a sufficient number now among the christians, who cultivated and were

(8) See *Ja. Hasaeus*, Liber de Academia Jureconsultorum Berytensi; and *Zacharias Mitylen.* de Opificio Dei, p. 164.

(9) *Zacharias Mitylen.* de Opificio Dei, p. 179. [Among the moderns, may be consulted *J. Andr. Schmidt's* Preface to *Andr. Hyperius* de Schola Alexandrina catechetica, Helmst. 1704. 8vo. *Hen. Dodwell*, ad fragmentum Philippi Sidetæ; at the end of his Dissert on Irenæus; *Lud. Thomasinus*, de Discipl. Eccles. tom. i. P. i. L. ii. c. 10. p. 210 &c. *Joh. Geo. Michaelis*, Exercit. de Scholæ Alexandrinæ sic dictæ Catecheticae origine, progressu, et præcipuis doctoribus; in tom. i. Symbolar. litter. Bremens. p. 195 &c. and *Jos. Bingham*, Antiqq. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 10. *Schl.*]

(10) *Aeneas Gazæus*, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 16, &c. passim. *Zacharias Mitylen.* loc. cit. p. 164, 179, 217, &c. and others.

(11) [See Note (7), supra p. 378. *Tr.*]

(12) *Marinus*, de Vita *Procli*, c. 9. p. 19. ed. Fabricii. [*Hera* was a preceptor of *Proclus*, and is the second of the three of his name, mentioned by *Brucker* in his *Historia crit. Philos.* Tom. ii. p. 323. *Schl.*]

(13) [This *Plutarch*, in distinction from the elder *Plutarch*, who was more of a historian than a philosopher, is denominated *Plutarchus Nestorii*, or *Plutarch the son of Nestorius*. See concerning him *Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.* Tom. ii. p. 312 &c. *Marinus*, de Vita *Procli*, c. 12. p. 27. and *Suidas*, article *Plutarch Nestorii*, p. 133. *Schl.*]

(14) [Concerning *Syrianus*, see *Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.* Tom. ii. p. 315. *Schl.*]

(15) His life was written by *Marinus*, and was published with learned notes, by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Hamb. 1700. 4to. [See also *Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.* Tom. ii. p. 318 &c. *Schl.*]

(16) See *Aeneas Gazæus*, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 8, 13. ed. Barthli. [Among the moderns, *Brucker*, (*Historia crit. Philosophiæ*, Tom. ii. p. 337,) has treated of all these disciples of *Proclus*. *Schl.*]

able to teach this species of wisdom, so much confided in at that day, it naturally followed, that fewer persons than formerly frequented the schools of these heathen sages.

§ 6. But although the philosophy of *Plato* appeared to most persons more favorable to religion and better founded, than that of *Aristotle*, yet the latter gradually emerged from its obscurity, and found its way into the hands of christians. The Platonists themselves expounded some of the books of *Aristotle*, in their schools, and particularly his *Dialectics*, which they recommended to such of their pupils as were fond of disputation. The christians did the same, in the schools in which they taught philosophy. This was the first step made by the Stagirite towards that universal empire, which he afterwards obtained. Another and a more active cause was found in the Origenian, Arian, Eutychian, Nestorian, and Pelagian contests, which produced so much evil in the church during this century. *Origen*, it was well known, was a Platonist. When therefore he fell under public censure, many, that they might not be accounted his adherents, applied themselves to the study of *Aristotle*, between whom and *Origen* there had been little or no connexion. In the Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian controversies, both sides had recourse to the most subtle distinctions, divisions, and ratiocinations; and with these they were supplied by the philosophy of *Aristotle*, and not at all by that of *Plato*, who never trained men to disputation. The Pelagian doctrines had great affinity with the opinions of *Plato* concerning God and the human soul. Many therefore ceased to be Platonists, as soon as they perceived this fact, and suffered their names to be enrolled among the Peripatetics.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. The outward form of church government somewhat changed.—§ 3. The prerogatives of patriarchs.—§ 4. Evils arising from their authority.—§ 5. Contests between them.—§ 6. The power of the Roman pontiff.—§ 7. Vices of the clergy.—§ 8. Causes thereof. The Saints.—§ 9. Monks.—§ 10. Teachers in the Greek church—§ 11. in the Latin church.

§ 1. From the operation of several causes, the outward form of government in the church experienced some change. The power of the bishops, particularly of the higher orders, was sometimes augmented and sometimes diminished, according as times and circumstances altered; yet the caprice of the court and political considerations had more influence in this matter, than any principles of ecclesiastical law. These changes however, were of minor importance. Of much more consequence was the vast increase of honor and power acquired by the bishops of New Rome, or Constantinople, in opposition to the most strenuous efforts of the bishop of ancient Rome. In the preceding century, the council of Constantinople [AD. 381.] had conferred on the bishop of New Rome the second rank among the highest bishops of the world, on account of the dignity and prerogatives of the city where he presided. The Constantinopolitan bishops (with the consent, no doubt, of the court,) had likewise extended their jurisdiction over the provinces of [proconsular] Asia, Thrace, and Pontus. In this century, with the consent of the emperors, they not only acquired the additional province of eastern Illyricum, but likewise a great amplification of their honors and prerogatives. For in the year 451, the council of Chalcedon, by their 28th *canon*, decreed that the bishop of New Rome ought to enjoy the same honors and prerogatives with the pontiff of ancient Rome, on account of the equal dignity and rank of the two cities; (1) and by a formal act, they confirmed his jurisdiction over the provinces which he claimed. *Leo* the Great, bishop of ancient Rome, and some other bishops, strenuously resisted this decree: but in vain, for the Greek emperors supported the cause of their bishops. (2) After the period of this council, the Constantinopoli-

(1) [Yet it appears, from the words of the canon, that the bishop of Constantinople, though made equal in *power and authority* with the bishop of Rome, was to yield to him a precedence in *rank or honor*; because New Rome took rank after her older sister, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχειν. *Tr.*]

(2) *Mich. le Quien*, *Oriens Christianus*, Tom. i. p. 30 &c. [See also *C. W. F.*

tan bishops fiercely contended for supremacy with the Roman bishops, and encroached on the privileges and dignity of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. In particular, *Acacius* of Constantinople, is said to have exceeded all bounds, in his ambitious projects.(3)

§ 2. It was nearly at the same time, that *Juvenal* bishop of Jerusalem, or rather of Aelia, attempted to withdraw himself and his church from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cesarea, and affected to rank among the first prelates of the christian world. His designs were rendered practicable by the high veneration entertained for the church of Jerusalem, as being not only founded and governed by apostles, but a continuation of the primitive church of Jerusalem, and in a sense the mother of all other christian churches. Therefore *Juvenal*, the emperor *Theodosius* Junior favoring his designs, not only assumed the rank of independent bishop of the three Palestines, or that of a *patriarch*, but likewise wrested Phenicia and Arabia from the patriarchate of Antioch. And as this produced a controversy between him and *Maximus* bishop of Antioch, the council of Chalcedon settled the dispute, by restoring Arabia and Phenicia to the see of Antioch, and leaving *Juvenal* in possession of the three Palestines,(4) with the title and rank which he had assumed.(5) In this manner there were five principal bishops over the christian world, created in this century, and distinguished from others by the title of *patriarchs*.(6) The oriental writers mention a sixth; namely, the bishop of *Seleucia and Ctesiphon*; to whom, they say, the bishop of Antioch voluntarily ceded a part of his jurisdiction.(7) But they can bring no proof, except the Arabic decrees of the Nicene council, which are well known to have no authority.

§ 3. These *patriarchs* had great prerogatives. To them belonged the consecration of the bishops of their respective provinces. They annually convoked councils of their districts, to regulate and settle ecclesiastical affairs. If any great or difficult controversy arose, it was carried before the patriarch.. The bishops accused of any offences, were obliged to abide by his decision. And finally, to provide for the peace and good order of the remo-

Walch, Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 310; and Historie der Päpste, p. 106. *Schl.*—and *Arch. Bower*, Lives of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 64—84. ed. Lond. 1750. 4to. *Tr.*]

(3) Nouveau Dictionaire hist. crit. Tome. i. Artic. *Acacius*, p. 75 &c. [Dr. *Mosheim* here speaks cautiously; for in fact, *Acucius*, when all circumstances are considered, was to be justified. See below, ch. v. § 21. *Schl.*]

(4) Concerning the *three Palestines*, see *Carolus a S. Paulo*, Geographia sacra, p. 307 &c.

(5) *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, Tom. iii. p. 110 &c.

(6) See the writers who have treated of the patriarchs, as enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Bibliograph. Antiquar. cap. xiii. p. 453 &c. [See also Note (2) p. 282 &c. of this volume. *Tr.*]

(7) *Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana, Tom. i. p. 9, 13 &c.

ter provinces of their patriarchates, they were allowed to place over them their own legates or *vicars*.(8) Other prerogatives of less moment are omitted. It was the fact, however, that some episcopal sees were not subject to the patriarchs; for both in the East and in the West, certain bishops were exempt from patriarchal jurisdiction, or were independent.(9) Moreover the emperors, who reserved to themselves the supreme power over the church, listened readily to the complaints of those who thought themselves injured; and the councils also, in which the majesty and the legislative power of the church resided, presented various obstacles to the arbitrary exercise of patriarchal power.

§ 4. The constitution of ecclesiastical government was so far from contributing to the peace and prosperity of the christian church, that it was rather the source of very great evils, and produced boundless dissensions and animosities. In the first place, the *patriarchs*, who had power either to do much good or to cause much evil, encroached without reserve upon the rights and privileges of their bishops, and thus introduced gradually a kind of spiritual bondage; and that they might do this with more freedom, they made no resistance to the encroachments of the bishops on the ancient rights of the people. For the more the prerogatives and the honors of the bishops who were under their control, were increased, the more was their own power enlarged. In

(8) *David Blondell*, de la Primauté de l' Eglise, cap. xxv. p. 332 &c. *Theod. Ruinart*, de pallio Archi-Episcopali, p. 445. Tom. ii. of the *Opp. posthuma* of *Joh. Mabillon*.

(9) *Edw. Brerewood*, de veteris ecclesiae gubernatione patriarchale, a tract which is subjoined to *Ja. Usher's* Opuscula de Episcopis et Metropolitanorum origine, Lond. 1687, and Bremen 1701. 8vo. p. 56—85. [The metropolitans and bishops who were subject to no patriarch were, by the Greeks, called ἀυτοκέφαλοι. Of this description were the metropolitans of *Bulgaria*, *Cyprus*, *Iberia*, *Armenia*, and also of *Britain*, before the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons by the Romish monk *Augustine*. For the Britons had their archbishop of *Caerleon*, (Episcopus Caerlegionis super Osca,) who had seven bishops under him, but acknowledged no superintendence from the patriarch of Rome, and for a long time made opposition to him; and in *Wales*, as well as in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, this independence continued for many centuries. The church of *Carthage* was also, properly, subject to no other church; as appears from *Leydecker's* *Historia Eccles. Africanæ*, and from the writings of *Capell* and others, de appellationibus ex Africa ad sedem Romanam.—Some common bishops, likewise, were subject to no metropolitan, but were under the immediate inspection of their patriarch. Thus the patriarch of Constantinople had 39 bishops in his diocese, who were subject immediately to him: and the Romish patriarch, had in almost all his countries, (e. g. in Germany, at Bamberg and Fulda,) bishops who were subject to no archbishop or primate, but dependent immediately on himself.—There were also certain bishops, who were subject neither to any archbishop nor to a patriarch; as was the case with the bishop of Tomis in Scythia, according to *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccl. L. vi. c. 21. The churches in countries lying without the Roman empire, at first had no bishops dependant on the bishops within the empire; as e. g. the churches in *Persia*, *Parthia*, and among the *Goths*; and these did not come under the power of Romish patriarchs, until they fell under the civil power of the Romans. Most of the conversions of pagans, by missionaries from Rome, were in the western provinces of the empire. See *Baumgarten's* *Erläuterung der christl. Alterthums*, p. 158 &c. *Schl.*]

(the next place, they designedly excited dissensions and fomented controversies, of bishops with one another and with other ministers of religion, and also of the people with the clergy; so that they might have frequent occasions to exercise their authority, be much appealed to, and have a multitude of clients around them. Moreover, that the bishops might not be without intestine foes, nor themselves destitute of strenuous defenders of their authority, they drew over to their side the numerous tribes of monks, who were gradually acquiring wealth, and attached them to their interests by the most ample largesses. And these monks contributed much,—perhaps more than any other cause,—to subvert the ancient discipline of the church, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and to increase beyond all bounds the power of their patrons.

§ 5. To these evils must be added the rivalry and ambition of the *patriarchs* themselves, which gave birth to abominable crimes and the most destructive wars. The patriarch of Constantinople, in particular, elated with the favor and the proximity of the imperial court, on the one hand, subjected the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to a subordination to himself, as if they were prelates of a secondary rank; and on the other hand, boldly attacked the Roman pontiff, and despoiled him of some of his provinces. The two former, from their lack of power and from other causes, made indeed but feeble resistance, though they sometimes produced violent tumults and commotions; but the Roman pontiff, possessing much greater power and resources, fought with more obstinacy, and in his turn inflicted deadly wounds on the Byzantine prelate. Those who shall carefully examine the history of events among christians from this period onward, will find, that from these quarrels about precedence and the boundaries of their power, among those who pretended to be the fathers and guardians of the church, chiefly originated those direful dissensions which first split the eastern church into various sects, and then severed it altogether from the church of the West.

§ 6. No one of these ambitious prelates was more successful than the Romish patriarch. Notwithstanding the opposition of the Constantinopolitan bishop, various causes enabled him to augment his power in no small degree; although he had not yet laid claim to the dignity of supreme law-giver, and judge of the whole christian church. In the East, the Alexandrine and Antiochian patriarchs, finding themselves unequal to contend with the patriarch of Constantinople, often applied to the Roman pontiff for aid against him;(10) and the same measures were adopted by the ordinary bishops, whenever they found the patriarchs of

(10) [This is illustrated, among other examples, by the case of *John Talaia*, patriarch of Alexandria, who being deposed, (A.D. 482,) applied to the Roman bishop *Simplicius* for protection. See *Liberatus* Diaconus, Breviar c. 18. *Schl.*—and *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 189 &c. 194. ed. Lond. 1750. *Tr.*]

Alexandria and Antioch invading their rights. To all these the pontiff so extended his protection, as thereby to advance the supremacy of the Roman see. In the West, the indolence and diminished power of the emperors, left the bishop of the metropolis at full liberty to attempt whatever he pleased. And the conquests of the barbarians were so far from setting bounds to his domination, that they rather advanced it. For these kings, caring for nothing but the establishment of their thrones, when they saw that the people obeyed implicitly the bishops, and that these were dependent almost wholly on the Roman pontiff, deemed it good policy to secure his favor by bestowing on him privileges and honors. Among all those who governed the see of Rome in this century, no one strove more vigorously and successfully to advance its authority, than *Leo*, who is commonly surnamed the *Great*. But neither he, nor the others, could overcome all obstacles to their ambition. This is evident, among other examples, from that of the Africans, whom no promises nor threats could induce, to consent to have their causes and controversies carried by appeal before the Roman tribunal.(11)

§ 7. Of the vices of the whole clerical order, their luxury, their arrogance, their avarice, their voluptuous lives, we have as many witnesses, as we have writers of integrity and gravity in this age, whose works have come down to us. The *bishops*, especially such as were distinguished for their rank and honors, employed various administrators to manage their affairs, and formed around themselves a kind of sacred court. The dignity of a *presbyter* was supposed to be so great, that *Martin* of Tours did not hesitate to say, at a public entertainment, that the emperor himself was inferior to one of that order.(12) The *deacons* were taxed

(11) *Lud. Ell. du Pin*, de antiqua Eccles. Disciplina, Diss. ii. p. 166 &c. *Melch. Leydecker*, Historia Eccles. Africanæ, Tom. ii. Diss. ii. p. 505 &c. [A concise view of the steps by which the bishops of Rome mounted to the summit of their grandeur, is thus given by *J. Andr. Cramer*, in his German translation of *Bossuet's* Universal History, vol. 4. p. 558 &c. as cited by *Von Einem*, in a note on this page of *Mosheim*. They were appointed by the emperors to decide causes in the western churches; they encouraged appeals to themselves; they assumed the care of all the churches, as if it were a part of their official duty; they appointed vicars in churches, over which they had no claims to jurisdiction; where they should have been only mediators, they assumed to be judges; they required accounts to be sent them of the affairs of foreign churches; they endeavored to impose the rites and usages of their own church upon all others, as being of apostolic origin; they traced their own elevation from the pre-eminence of *St. Peter*; they maintained that their fancied prerogatives belonged to them by a *divine right*; they threatened with excommunication from the church, those who would not submit to their decrees; they set up and deposed metropolitans, in provinces over which they never legally had jurisdiction; and each successive pope was careful, at least, not to lose any thing of the illegal usurpations of his predecessors, if he did not actually add to them. The truth of this representation is abundantly confirmed with the evidence of historical facts, by various Protestant writers; and, among others, by *Arch. Bower*, in his *Lives of the Popes*, 7 vol. 4to. London 1749 &c. Tr.]

(12) *Sulpitius Severus*, de vita Martini, cap. xx. p. 339. and Dial. ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

with their pride and their vices, in many decrees of the councils.(13) These stains on the character of the clergy would have been deemed insufferable, had not most of the people been sunk in superstition and ignorance, and had not all estimated the rights and privileges of christian ministers, by those of the ancient priests, as well among the Hebrews as among the Greeks and Romans. The fierce and warlike tribes of Germans, who vanquished the Romans and divided up the empire of the West among themselves, after they had embraced christianity, could bear with the dominion and the vices of the bishops and the clergy, because they had before been subject to the domination of priests; and they supposed the christian priests and ministers of religion possessed the same rights with their former idolatrous priests.(14)

§ 8. This corruption among an order of men, whose duty it was to inculcate holiness both by precept and example, will afford us less surprize, when we consider, that a great multitude of persons were every where admitted, indiscriminately, and without examination, among the clergy; the greater part of whom had no other object than to live in idleness. And among these, very many were connected with no particular church or place, and had no regular employment, but roamed about at large, procuring a subsistence by imposing upon the credulity of others, and sometimes by dishonorable artifices. Whence then, some may ask, those numerous *saints* of this century, who are reported to us by both the eastern and the western writers? I answer, they were canonized by the ignorance of the age. Whoever possessed some excellence of talents and ingenuity, if they excelled considerably

(13) See *Dav. Blondell*, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 140.

(14) [That these pagan nations had been accustomed to treat their idolatrous priests with extraordinary reverence, is a fact well known. When they became christians, they supposed they must shew the same respect to the christian priests. Of course, they honored their bishops and clergy, as they had before honored their *Druids*; and this reverence disposed them to bear patiently with their vices. Every *Druid* was accounted a very great character, and was feared by every one; but the *Chief Druid* was actually worshipped. When these people became christians, they supposed, that the *bishop of Rome* was such a *Chief Druid*; and that he must be honored accordingly. And this was one cause, why the Roman pontiff obtained, in process of time, such an ascendancy in the western countries. The patriarch of Constantinople rose indeed to a great elevation; but he never attained the high rank and authority of the Roman patriarch. The reason was, that the people of the East had not the same ideas of the dignity of a *Chief Priest*, as the people of the West had. The eastern clergy also practiced *excommunication*, as a punishment of transgressors; but it never had such an influence in the East, as it had in the West; and for this reason, that the effects of a pagan exclusion from religious privileges, never were so great in the East as in the West. The effects in the latter, are described by *Julius Caesar*, *de Bello Gallico*, L. vi. c. 13. n. 6 &c. Si quis aut *privatus* aut *populus* eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Haec poena apud eos est *gravissima*. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac sceleratorum babentur; ab iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque iis potentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur. *Schl.*]

as writers or speakers, if they possessed dexterity in managing affairs of importance, or were distinguished for their self-government, and the control of their passions; these persons, in an age of ignorance, appeared to those around them, to be not men, but Gods; or to speak more correctly, were considered as men divinely inspired and full of the Deity.

§ 9. The *monks*, who had formerly lived for themselves, and who had not sought to rank among the clergy, gradually became a class distinct from the common laity, and acquired such opulence and such high privileges, that they could claim an honorable rank among the chief supports and pillars of the church.(15) The reputation of this class of persons, for piety and sanctity, was so great, that very often, when a bishop or a presbyter was to be elected, he was chosen from among them;(16) and the erection of edifices in which monks and nuns might conveniently serve God, was carried beyond all bounds.(17) They did not, however, all observe one and the same system of rules; but, some followed the rules of *Augustine*, others those of *Basil*, and others those of *Antony*, or *Athanasius*, or *Pachomius*, &c.(18) Yet

(15) *Epiphanius*, *Exposit. Fidei*, Opp. Tom. i. p. 1094. *Joh. Mabillon*, *Response aux Chanoines reguliers*, Opp. posthum. Tom. ii. p. 115.

(16) *Sulpitius Severus*, *de vita Martini*, c. x. p. 320. Add, Dial. i. c. xxi. p. 426.

(17) *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. p. 419. *Henr. Noris*, *Historia Pelagiana*, Lib. ii. c. 3. in Opp. Tom. i. p. 273. *Histoire litteraire de la France*, Tom. ii. p. 35.

(18) [A *monk* was one who professed wholly to renounce this world, with all its cares and pleasures, and to make religion his sole business. The particular manner in which he proposed to employ himself, was called his *rule*. The early monks, of the third century, were all *Eremites* or hermits; that is, they retired from all human society, and lived in solitude in the deserts and mountains. Such in particular were the Egyptian monks. In the fourth century they became so numerous in Egypt, as to turn their favorite desert into a populous country; and *St. Antony*, a leading man among them, induced great numbers to adopt his particular rule. *St. Pachomius* about the same time organized the monks of *Tabennesis* into a kind of *society*; and henceforth most monks became *associated hermits*, having separate cells, but living under chiefs called *abbots*. *Basil* the Great improved on the plan of *Pachomius*, by erecting houses in different parts of the country, in which monks might live together in a kind of family state. He also made his monasteries *schools* for the cultivation of sacred learning. *St. Athanasius*, according to some (see Note 26, p. 319, above), while resident in Italy, taught the people of that country how to form and regulate these associations of monks. And *St. Augustine* first established a kind of monastery in his native town in Africa; and afterwards, when bishop of Hippo, he and some of his clergy formed an association for religious purposes, which gave rise to the *regular Canons*, a species of clergy whose private life was that of monks. During the fifth century, the passion for monastic life was very great, and monks and nuns became extremely numerous in the West as well as the East. Yet, hitherto there had not been required of monks any vows of *perpetual* celibacy, poverty, and obedience, nor of adherence forever to any one rule of life; but every one was free to continue a monk or not, and to pass from one society or class of monks to another, at his option. Different monasteries had different rules, according to the will of their founders or governors; but in all, the written rules, if they had any, were few and simple, the abbots possessing despotic power over their little kingdoms. The diversity which now prevailed among the monasteries as to their rules, is thus described by father *Mabillon*, (*Annales Benedictini*,

it must have been the fact, that they were all very remiss and negligent in the observance of their rules, since the licentiousness of monks was even in this century become proverbial;(19) and these armies of lazy men, we are told, excited in various places dreadful seditions. From the enactments of the councils of this century, it clearly appears, that all monks of every sort were under the protection of the bishops in whose dioceses they lived; nor did the *patriarchs*, as yet, arrogate to themselves any jurisdiction over them.(20)

§ 10. Among the Greek and oriental writers of this century, the most distinguished was *Cyril*, bishop of Alexandria, very famous for his different controversies and writings. No impartial person will divest him of all praise; yet no good man will excuse his quarrelsome temper, his restless spirit, and his very great transgressions.(21) Next to him must be placed *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, whose merits in every branch of theological learning are by no means contemptible, notwithstanding he is said to have imbibed some part

Lib. i. § 13. Tom i. p. 6 &c.) "As well in the East as in the West, *there were almost as many different forms and rules, as there were different cells and monasteries*, says *Cassianus*, Institut. L. ii. c. 1. In some, the pleasure of the abbot was the only rule; in others, the mode of life was regulated by custom and former usage; in most, however, there were written rules. And, because all monastic rules, whether written or not, aimed at one and the same object, viz. to withdraw men from all worldly concerns, and from all worldly thoughts, so that they might be wholly devoted to God and religion; the monasteries were not, in general, so confined to any one rule but that they could adopt or superinduce an other, at the discretion of the abbot; and this, without changing their profession, and without harm. Hence, in the same monastery, diverse written rules were observed at the same time, with such modifications as were necessary to adapt them to particular times and places. And yet, amidst this great diversity of rules, there was the greatest harmony among all the monks, who constituted in reality but one society and one body, and were distinguished from each other by no peculiarities of dress. Removal also from one monastery to another, and mutual abode with each other, were easy and free; and not only where both monasteries were of Latins, but also where one was of Latins and the other of Greeks." Tr.]

(19) *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. cap. viii. p. 399 &c.

(20) See *Joh. Launoy*, Inquisitio in chartam immunitatis B. Germani, in his Opp. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. 3 &c. 38 &c. In the ancient records, posterior to this century, the monks are often called (*clerici*) clergymen. See *Joh. Mabillon*, Praefatio ad Saecul. ii. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, p. xiv. And this is evidence, that they now began to be ranked among the *clergy*, or ministers of the church.

(21) The works of *Cyril* were published by *Joh. Aubertuz*, at Paris 1638, vi. vol. [in vii Parts,] Folio.—[*St. Cyrillus* was nephew to *Theophilus*, and his successor in the chair of Alexandria, from AD. 412 to 444. Soon after his election, he persecuted the Novatians; assumed the direction of political affairs; quarrelled with *Orestes*, the governor of Egypt; and is said, to have occasioned several insurrections and much bloodshed, at Alexandria; to have instigated the murder of *Hypatia*, an eminent female philosopher; and to have pulled down the Jews' synagogue, plundered it, and chased the Jews from the city. See *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 7, 13, 14, 15. and *Damasius*, in *Suidas*, Lex. voce ὑπατία. From the year 329, he was the most zealous and efficient opposer of *Nestorius* and his doctrines; wrote against him; condemned his doctrines in a synod at Alexandria, in his noted xii Chapters; presided in the council of Ephesus, where

of the Nestorian doctrine.(22) *Isidorus Pelusiota* has left us [numerous, short] Epistles, which display more piety, ingenuity, erudition, and judgment, than the large volumes of some others.(23) *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, has left us very lit-

Nestorius was condemned and deposed AD. 431. His zeal against *Nestorius* drew on himself deposition, by some oriental bishops; but he was soon restored. With the bishop of Rome, he was always on the most friendly terms. He was certainly a man of talents, and his voluminous writings display much acuteness and learning, though the style is unpolished and not very clear. More than half of them, are expositions of the scriptures; viz. of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and the Gospel of John. The others are polemic treatises, against Arians, Nestorians, and others, who erred in respect to the Trinity and the person of *Christ*; 10 Books against *Julian*; about 50 Sermons; and near 60 Letters. See his life, in *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xviii. p. 313—354. Tr.]

(22) For a fine edition of the whole works of *Theodoret*, we are indebted to the Jesuit, *Jac. Sirmond*, who edited them at Paris, 1642, in iv volumes, Folio. The Jesuit *Jo. Garnier*, afterwards, added a fifth volume, Paris 1685, Folio. [*Theodoret*, or *Theodorit*, was born at Antioch, about the year 386, of wealthy and pious parents. He was their only child, and, like *Samuel*, the son of their vows; and therefore named *Theodoretus*, given of God. When not quite seven years old, he was placed in a neighboring monastery for education, where he had for associates, *Nestorius* and *John*, who became the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch; and for instructors, *Theodorus*, bishop of Mopsuestia, and *Chrysostom*, from whom he learned eloquence and sacred literature. He became early pious, was made first lector, and then deacon, in the church of Antioch; and in the year 420, was ordained bishop of *Cyrus*, a considerable city in Syria, near the Euphrates, where he is said to have had the charge of 800 churches. The country was overrun with antitrinitarian sectarians and with Marcionites; of whom he nearly purged his diocese, having, as he says, baptized no less than 10,000 Marcionites. In the year 429, his early friend *Nestorius* broached his errors respecting the person of *Christ*, and was condemned by *Cyril* of Alexandria. *Theodoret* espoused the cause of his friend, which involved him in a quarrel with *Cyril*, as long as they lived. He was one of those, who in the year 431, deposed *Cyril* at Ephesus; for which he was sent home in disgrace, by the emperor, *Theodosius* Junior. *Cyril* died in 444; and *Theodoret* expressed his joy at the event, which so enraged the emperor, that he confined him to his house. In 449, he was deposed in the second synod of Ephesus, and applied to the bishop of Rome, who now espoused his cause. *Theodosius* died in 450, and his successor restored *Theodoret* to his see; and afterwards summoned him to be a member of the council of Chalcedon in 451, where he professed his orthodoxy, and was reluctantly brought to condemn *Nestorius*. After this, returning to his diocese, he devolved most of his episcopal duties on *Hypatius*, and devoted himself to writing books, till the year 457, when he died, aged about 71. He was frank, open-hearted, ingenuous, had elevated views and feelings, was resolute and unbending, yet generous, sympathetic, and ardently pious. His learning was great, his genius good, and his productions among the best of that age. The first and second vol. of his works embrace his Commentaries on the greater part of the O. Testament. Volume third contains Comments on all the Epistles of Paul; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in v Books; (a continuation of *Eusebius*, from AD. 320 to AD. 427, written in a style elevated, clear, and well adapted to history;) *Philotheus*, or *Historia Religiosa*; (eulogies of 30 distinguished monks;) and 146 Epistles. Volume fourth contains iv Books or Dialogues, entitled *Eranistes*, or *Poly-morphus*; (polemic, on the person of *Christ*;) *Hareticarum Fabular. Lib. v.* (an account of the ancient Heresies;) *de Providentia Orationes x. adversus Gentes*, or *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, (an apology for christianity,) in xii Books; and some other small pieces. The fifth vol. contains some other expository pieces, several Sermons, 34 Epistles, and vii Dialogues against the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarists.—All his works, Gr. and Lat. with Notes, were republished by *J. L. Schulze*, Halle, 1768—74, in 5 volumes, in *nine*, 8vo. See his life, in *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xviii. p. 355—432. Tr.]

(23) The best edition of these Letters, is that of the Jesuit, *Andr. Schott*, Paris,

tle in writing ; but has perpetuated his name, by his opposition to *Origen* and to his followers.(24) *Palladius*, on account of his *Lausiack History*, and his *Life of Chrysostom*, deserves a place among the respectable and useful writers.(25) Notwithstanding *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia was accused, after his death, of the grossest errors, yet every one who has examined the extracts from his writings by *Photius*, will regret that his works are either en-

1638, Fol.—[*Isidorus* was probably a native of Alexandria, but he spent his life in a monastery near *Pclusium*, now *Damietta*, on one of the mouths of the Nile ; and hence his surname of *Pelusiota*. He flourished about AD. 412 ; but was active and conspicuous from the year 388, to 431. As a monk he was very austere in his mode of living ; and retiring from the noise and bustle of the world, he devoted himself to reading and expounding the scriptures, and to the practice and the promotion of piety and virtue. He chose the epistolary form of writing ; and has left us 2013 short Letters, which are divided into five Books. In most of them a question is proposed, and answered by the exposition of a text of scripture. The object is to expound the scriptures, and to inculcate the doctrines and duties of religion. He was an admirer of *Chrysostom* ; and of course, had difficulty with *Theophilus* and *Cyril*, the patriarchs of Alexandria. But he feared no man, whenever he thought duty called him to defend truth, or to censure vice. Tr.]

(24) See *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103. [*Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria from the year 385, to the year 412, was a man of a strong, active, courageous mind ; but crafty, unscrupulous, selfish, and ambitious. He probably spent some of his early years among the monks of Nitria. Afterwards he became a presbyter of Alexandria, wrote a Paschal Cycle in 380, and was made bishop in 385. In the year 388 when *Theodosius* senior waged war in Italy upon *Maximus* the usurper, *Theophilus* sent his legate, *Isidorus*, to Rome, with letters and presents for both emperors ; but with instructions to await the issue of the battle, and then to present only the letter and presents directed to the victor. (*Sozomen*, H. E. viii. 2.) In the year 391, he solicited and obtained of the emperor, leave to persecute the pagans of Alexandria ; and proceeded to demolish their temples, and seize whatever was valuable in them. Insurrections, and bloodshed, and the flight of the philosophers from Egypt, were the consequence. (*Socrates*, H. E. v. c. 16.) The major part of the ignorant monks of Nitria had so gross ideas of the supreme Being, as to suppose he literally had eyes and feet and hands ; and were therefore called *Anthropomorphites*. But the better informed monks held, that these expressions were to be taken metaphorically, as *Origen* had always interpreted them. And thus, this controversy resolved itself into a contest respecting *Origen's* correctness as a theologian. At first, *Theophilus* favored the Origenists ; but the *Anthropomorphites* came upon him tumultuously, about the year 399, and compelled him to change sides. From this time, he was a zealous persecutor of all Origenists, (notwithstanding he continued to read and admire his works,) and actually made a bloody crusade against those Nitric monks, who opposed the *Anthropomorphites*, drove them from Egypt, and followed them with persecution ; and also all who befriended them, and in particular *Chrysostom*, whom he deposed in the year 403. See *Socrates*, H. E. vi. 7—17. *Sozomen*, viii. 11—19.—His works are not numerous, and have never been collected and published by themselves. They consist of three Paschal Letters, or Episcopal Charges ; several Letters ; and considerable extracts from different polemic treatises. Tr.]

(25) [*Palladius* was born in Galatia, in the year 368. In his 20th year, he went to Egypt, and spent several years among different tribes of monks. The failure of his health obliged him to return from the wilderness to Alexandria, and thence to Palestine. In the year 400, *Chrysostom* made him bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia ; which he exchanged, some years after, for Aspona in Galatia. The time of his death is unknown ; but it is supposed to have been before AD. 431. *Palladius* was a man of moderate talents and erudition, but pious, a devoted monk, and a perspicuous, unassuming writer. His works are, (I.) *Historia Lausiaca*, seu *de SS. Patrum vitis, ad Lausum cubiculi Praefectum* ; (Biography of 30

tirely lost, or exist only in Syriac, among the Nestorians.(26) *Nilus* composed many works calculated to excite religious emotions, but more commendable for the pious intentions of the writer, than for his accurate and labored thoughts.(27) Our designed brevity obliges us to pass over what might be worthy of notice in *Basil* of Seleucia,(28) *Theodotus* of Ancyra,(29) *Gelasius* of Cyzicum,(30) and others.(31)

of the most famous monks ;) written about the year 421 ; edited Gr. and Lat. by *Fronto le Duc*, in his *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ii. p. 893—1053, Paris 1624, Fol. Some additions were afterwards published by *Cotelier*, *Monument. Eccl.* Gr. tom. iii. Several Latin translations are extant, often published.—(II.) *Dialogus de Vita S. Johan. Chrysostomi, inter Palladium Episc. Hellenopolitanum et Theodorum*, (Life or Eulogy of *John Chrysostom*,) first published Gr. and Lat. by *Emer. Bigot*, Paris 1680, and again 1738, 4to; with some other works. Whether the *Palladius* who wrote this, was the same as the author of the *Lausiaca History*, has been questioned.—(III.) *De gentibus Indiae, et Brachmannis Liber*, is extant under his name; but it is not supposed to be genuine. *Tr.*]

(26) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii. P. ii. p. 227. [and *ibid.* P. i. p. 3—362, where we have *Ebed Jesu's* catalogue of his works.—*Theodorus* was born and educated at Antioch, where he was sometime a presbyter, and where he and *Chrysostom* instructed youth in a monastery, and had for pupils *Theodoret*, the famous *Nestorius*, patriarch of Constantinople, and *John*, patriarch of Antioch. In the year 392, he was made bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, where he spent 36 years, with great reputation as a preacher, a bishop, and especially as an author. After his death, which happened in the year 428, he was accused of *Nestorian*, and likewise of *Pelagian* sentiments; and was condemned as a heretic, in the fifth general council, at Constantinople, AD. 553. His writings were very numerous, embracing literal expositions of nearly the whole bible; elaborate polemic works, against the Arians, Eunomians, Apollinarists &c. with many Sermons and Epistles, and a Liturgy. A Latin translation of the last, is in *Renaudot*, *Liturgiar. Oriental. Collectio*, tom. ii. p. 616—625. His *Expositio Fidei* entire, with copious extracts from many of his other works, are extant in the Acts of the fifth general council, apud *Harduin*, tom. iii. in the works of *Marius Mercator*, and of other Fathers, and in the *Catenae Patrum*, especially the *Catena in Octateuchum*, Lips. 1772. 2 vol. Fol. and in *Münter's Fragmenta Patr.* Gr. Fascic. i. p. 79 &c. Copenhagen. 1788. 8vo. See *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xv. p. 176—218. and *Lardner*, *Credibility &c.* vol. ix. p. 389 &c. *Tr.*]

(27) [*Nilus* was born of a noble family, at Constantinople, where he became prefect of the city. Under the preaching of *Chrysostom*, he became pious, renounced the world, separated from his wife, and taking one of his two sons with him, retired among the monks of Egypt, where he spent the remainder of his days. By robbers he lost all his property, and had his son captured; but he recovered his son. He was made a presbyter, and probably lived till near the middle of this century. His numerous writings have been read with pleasure, by the lovers of monastic piety. His 355 Epistles were published, Gr. and Lat. by *Leo Allatius*, Rome, 1668, Fol. and his *Opuscula*, (21 treatises on moral and ascetic subjects,) Gr. and Lat. by *Jos. Maria Suares*, Rome, 1673, Fol. *Tr.*]

(28) [*Basil* was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, before the year 448, and continued so till after the year 458. He possessed some talents; but he was an unstable man. In the council of Constantinople AD. 448, he voted with the orthodox, and condemned *Eutyches*. The next year, in the council of Ephesus, he openly sided with the Eutychians, and anathematized the orthodox. And two years after in the council of Chalcedon, he appeared again on the orthodox side, and said he had been compelled to act with the Eutychians; but he had much difficulty to persuade the orthodox of his sincerity, and to allow him his episcopal office.—His works were published, Gr. and Lat. subjoined to those of *Gregory Thaumaturgus* and *Macarius* the monk, Paris 1622, Fol. They consist of 43 Orations; of which 17 are on the O. Testament, and 26 on the New; written in a lofty style, and tolerably perspicuous, but excessively flowery. The *Demon-*

stration that Christ has come, against the Jews, founded on the 70 weeks of Daniel; and the two Books on the *Life of St. Thecla*, the virgin and martyr; though printed among his works, are supposed by many to be not genuine. *Tr.*]

(29) [*Theodotus*, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, flourished about the year 430. Little is known of him, except that he acted a conspicuous part in the council of Ephesus, which condemned *Nestorius*, in the year 431. Three Orations, which he then delivered at Ephesus. (2 on Christmas day, and one against *Nestorius*,) are extant, Gr. and Lat. among the Acts of that council, tom. iii. p. 988, 1008, 1024. Another of his orations was published with the works of *Amphilochius*, Paris 1644. His *Exposition of the Nicene creed*, or *Confutation of Nestorius*, was published Gr. and Lat. by *Combefis*, Paris 1675, 12mo. *Theodotus*, in the close of the last mentioned work, refers to his three Books on the *Holy Spirit*, which are lost; as are his seven Books against *Nestorius*, addressed to *Lausus*. He has been accounted a good polemic writer. *Tr.*]

(30) [*Gelasius* Cyzicenus was a native of *Cyzicus*, an island in the Propontis, where his father was a presbyter. He flourished about AD. 476, and was bishop of Cesarea in Palestine. He is known chiefly by his *History of the Nicene Council*, or as the Gr. MSS. style it, *his Ecclesiastical History*, in iii Books. The first Book contains the affairs of *Constantine*, till the death of *Licinius* in 324. The second contains subsequent events, the calling of the council, and the transactions in it, and during it, especially the disputes of the philosophers and Arians with the Nicene fathers. The third Book, which is now lost, contained the subsequent life and deeds of *Constantine*. As for the sources from which he drew his information, he tells us, that when a boy, at *Cyzicus*, he met with an old M.S. history of the Nicene council, written by one *Dalmatius* a former bishop of *Cyzicus*; that he then made large extracts from it; and many years after, composed his history from these extracts and from the writings of *Eusebius*, *Rufinus* &c. This work of *Gelasius*, once in high repute, is now little esteemed; in particular, the account of the disputes of the philosophers and Arians, which constitute the greater part of the second book, are considered very questionable. The two surviving books were published, Gr. and Lat. by *R. Balf. Scot*, Paris, 1599, 8vo; and in the Collections of Councils, by *Harduin* Tom. i. p. —. *Tr.*]

(31) [The Greek and oriental writers, passed by in silence by *Dr. Mosheim*, are very numerous. As some knowledge of them is useful, and indeed necessary for a theologian, a tolerably complete catalogue of them, extracted from *Cave's Historia Litteraria*, is here subjoined.

Asterius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus; flourished about AD. 401; an eloquent and popular preacher. More than 20 of his Homilies are published, by *Combefis & Cotelier*.

Marcus, a monk of Nitria, Egypt; flourished AD. 401. Seven tracts on practical piety, written with great simplicity, are extant in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr. Tom. i.

Victor of Antioch, a contemporary of *Chrysostom*; wrote a Commentary on Mark's Gospel; extant, Lat. in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. iv. p. 370.

Severianus, bishop of Gabala in Syria; flourished AD. 401; a turgid writer, but a popular preacher. Twelve of his orations are extant, among the works of *Chrysostom*.

Heraclides, a monk of Constantinople; flourished AD. 402. He wrote *Paradisus*, or Lives of the monks; much of which is copied into the Lausiaca History of *Palladius*, and the remainder was published by *Cotelier*, Monument. Eccl. Gr. Tom. iii.

Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, AD. 406—427; an enemy of *Chrysostom*, but famed for learning, address, and piety. Two of his letters, and some fragments, are extant.

Polychronius, bishop of Apamea; flourished AD. 410—427; was brother to *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia. His exposition of the Canticles, and fragments of his Commentary on Ezekiel, and Daniel, are extant.

Nonnus, a converted pagan poet, of Egypt; flourished AD. 410. His *Dionysiaca*, in 48 Books, written before his conversion; have been often published; e. g. Hanover 1605, 8vo. His poetic version of John's Gospel, was published, Gr. and Lat. by *Heinsius*, 1627, 8vo. and his *Collectio et Explicatio Historiarum*; by *R. Montague*, Eton, 1610, 4to. He was a scholar, but a turgid writer.

Synesius, a philosopher, statesman, poet, and after AD. 410, bishop of Ptolemais, in Cyrene, Africa; a man of fine talents, and a devoted bishop; but more

of a philosopher, than theologian. Besides several treatises, philosophical, political, and historical; he has left us 155 Epistles, 10 Hymns, and some Sermons; all published, Gr. and Lat. by *Petavius*. Paris, 1612, and 1633, Fol.

Philip of Side in Pamphylia, a friend of *Chrysostom*, and candidate for the see of Constantinople in 427. He wrote a religious History, from the creation to his own times, in 36 Books; a prolix and tedious work, of which only extracts remain.

Eudocia, a learned Athenian lady, born AD. 401, converted to christianity at 20, and soon after married to the emperor *Theodosius II*; proclaimed empress in 432; divorced, for a slight cause, in 445; then retired to Jerusalem, and spent her life in works of charity and beneficence; and in composing *Centones Homericæ*, poetic paraphrases of the Bible, and other religious poems. She died AD. 459, aged 58.

Philostorgius, born in Cappadocia AD. 368, well educated at Constantinople, a *Eunomian* or *Semi-Arian* in principle. He composed, about the year 425, an Ecclesiastical History, in xii Books, extending from the first rise of Arianism, to AD. 425. The work itself is lost; but an epitome of it by *Photius*, was edited by *Valesius*, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians. His work was partial to the Arians; and is therefore censured by *Photius* and others.

Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace; flourished AD. 425. He was of the sect of *Macedonius*; and published a Collection of the acts of the councils, from AD. 325, to 425. The work is lost, except some extracts, preserved by *Socrates* and others.

John, bishop of Antioch, AD. 427—441. He at first supported his early friend *Nestorius*; but afterwards abandoned him and his sect. Six of his Epistles are extant Gr. and Lat. in Collect. Concilior. Tom. iii; and fifteen more, Latin, in *Lupus*' Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Nestorius, presbyter at Antioch, and bishop of Constantinople, AD. 428—431. As a bishop, he was very zealous to suppress all the prevailing heresies; but he soon incurred the charge of heresy himself, by maintaining, that in the person of *Christ*, the two natures were not so united as to form but *one person*; and that it was improper to call *Mary Θεοτόκος the mother of God*; though she might be called *Χριστοτόκος the mother of Christ*. For this opinion, he was condemned and deposed, in the council of Ephesus, AD. 431. Afterwards, the emperor confined him to a monastery near Antioch; and then banished him to the deserts of Egypt, where he wandered several years, suffered much, and at last died. He was a popular preacher, and an active bishop, but, according to *Socrates*, (H. E. viii. 32.) not a very profound man. Besides numerous extracts from various of his works, several entire Epistles and some Sermons, are extant, in the Collections of councils, in *Lupus*' Ephesine Epistles, and in the works of *Chrysostom*, *Mercator*, &c.

Meletius, bishop of Mopsuestia, AD. 428 and onwards; a staunch Nestorian, deposed and banished for this heresy. Eleven of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Isaac, a converted Jew, flourished AD. 430, author of a treatise *on the Trinity, and the incarnation of Christ*, in bad Greek; extant among the *Opuscula Veterum dogmatica*; published by *Sirmond*, Paris, 1630. 8vo.

Acacius, a monk, and bishop of Beraea, from about 378, to 436. He was a man in high repute, and has left us three epistles.

Acacius, bishop of Melitene in Armenia; a staunch opposer of *Nestorius*, in the council of Ephesus AD. 431. A homily he delivered there, and an Epistle, are extant; in the Concil. Tom. iii. and in *Lupus*' Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Dorotheus, bishop of Martianopolis in Moesia; a bold defender of *Nestorius*, at Ephesus AD. 431. and therefore deposed, and at last banished. Four of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis in Syria; a defender of *Nestorius* at Ephesus AD. 431. and therefore deposed and banished. He has 23 Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Maximinus, bishop of Anazarbum in Cilicia; a defender of *Nestorius*, at Ephesus AD. 431; but afterwards renounced him. He has three Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Helladius, for sixty years, abbot of a monastery near Antioch; and then bishop of Tarsus. While a bishop, he defended *Nestorius* in the council of Ephesus,

and for some time after ; but at length renounced him. Six of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Euthérius, archbishop of Tyanea ; defended *Nestorius* in the council of Ephesus, though not a Nestorian in sentiment. He was deposed and banished. Five of his Epistles are extant, in the Ephesine Collection ; and *seventeen* of his Sermons, against various heresies, Gr. and Lat. among the works of *Athanasius*.

Paul, bishop of Emesa ; a defender of *Nestorius* in the Ephesine council ; but who afterwards retracted. He has left us a confession of his faith, *two* Homilies, and an Epistle.

Andreas, bishop of Samosata ; a defender of *Nestorius* from the year 429—to 436, when he renounced him. He has *eight* Epistles, in the Ephesine Collection.

Proclus, amanuensis to *Chrysostom*, and to *Atticus* ; and the bishop of Constantinople, AD. 432—446. He was a very pious man, a good scholar, and a popular preacher. His works, consisting of twenty Sermons, and six Epistles, were published, Gr. and Lat. by *Ricardi*, Rome, 1630, 4to.

Ibas, from about AD. 436, bishop of Edessa. He was accused of Nestorianism and acquitted, in 448 ; but was accused again, and condemned, in 449 ; and restored in 451. The greater part of a valuable letter of his, containing a history of the Nestorian contests, is extant, Gr. and Lat. in the Concilior. Tom. iv. p. 661.

Socrates, Scholasticus, a barrister at Constantinople ; flourished AD. 440. He composed a faithful Ecclesiastical History, from the accession of *Constantine* the Great, to AD. 439, in vii Books ; which is edited by *Valesius*, among the Greek Eccl. Historians.

Hermias Sozomenus, also a Constantinopolitan barrister, and an author of an Ecclesiastical History, from AD. 324, to AD. 439, in ix Books. He is a more vivacious writer than *Socrates*, but is deemed less judicious. Yet, writing after *Socrates*, he has supplied some of his deficiencies. The work was edited, by *Valesius*, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians.

Irenæus, Count of the empire, and the emperor's commissioner at the council of Ephesus in 431. He favored the Nestorians, in that council ; and defended their cause all his life ; and therefore, was excluded the court in 435, became bishop of Tyre in 444, was deposed by the emperor in 448 ; and then commenced writing a copious *Memoir* of the Ephesine council, and of ecclesiastical affairs in the East for about twenty years. The work is lost, except the old Latin translation of certain parts of it, which was published by *Christian Lupus*, Louvain, 1682, 4to. under the title of *Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*.

Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, AD. 447—449. He has left us *two* Epistles, and a Creed ; extant in *Baluze*, Nov. Collect. Concilior.

Eutyches, the heretic, a presbyter of Constantinople. He so opposed Nestorianism, as to confound the *two natures*, as well as the *two persons* of *Christ*. This error he broached in the year 448. He was condemned the same year ; appealed to a general council, and was again condemned in 451. A Confession of his faith, with a few of his Letters, is extant.

Eusebius, first a civilian at Constantinople, and then bishop of Dorylaeum in Phrygia. He was the public accuser of *Nestorius*, of *Eutyches*, and of *Dioscorus* ; from the year 430, to 451. His Libels, and some other of his documents are extant.

Diadochus, bishop of Photice in Epirus ; flourished AD. 450. He has left us some treatises on practical religion ; ed. Gr. at Florence, 1578 : and Lat. in Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. v.

Euthalius, a deacon in Egypt ; flourished perhaps AD. 458. He wrote an analytical Introduction to the books of the New Testament, published, Gr. and Lat. by *Zacagnius*, Rome, 1698, 4to.

Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, AD. 471—488 ; very ambitious and active for the aggrandisement of his see. He has left us only *two* Epistles.

Nestorianus, a Greek chronographer, who flourished about the year 474. He wrote, *Lives of the Roman emperors*, to AD. 474. The work was highly commended by *John Malala* ; but it is lost.

Johannes Aegeates, a Nestorian ; flourished AD. 483, or later ; and wrote an Ecclesiastical History, in 10 Books ; of which, (says *Photius*,) the *five* first Books reached from AD. 428, to 479. Only some extracts of it remain.

Sabas, a Syrian monk and abbot, born in 439, died 531. He wrote a *Typicum*,

§ 11. Among the Latin writers, the first place is due to the Roman pontiff, *Leo I*, surnamed the *Great*; a man of eloquence and genius, but immoderately devoted to the extension of the limits of his power.(32) [*Paul*] *Orosius* acquired fame by his *history*, written with a view to confute the cavils of the pagans, and by his Books against the Pelagians and Priscillianists.(33) [*John*] *Cassianus*, a man without erudition and superstitious, by

or the order of prayer for the whole year; which was adopted in all the monasteries about Jerusalem, and is still extant.

Justin, a bishop in Sicily, AD. 484; author of some Epistles, and, (as *Dodwell* supposes,) of the *Questiones ad Orthodoxos*, published among the works of *Justin Martyr*.

Aeneas Gazaeus, a sophist and a Platonist, and then a christian; flourished about AD. 488. He was the author of a noted *Dialogue*, entitled *Theophrastus*, or, on the Immortality of souls and the Resurrection of the body; ed. Gr. and Lat. by *Barth*, Lips. 1658, 4to.

Athanasius junior, or *Celetes*; bishop of Alexandria AD. 490—497; a fine biblical scholar, an active and good bishop, and a devout man. He is supposed to be the author of several of the works ascribed to *Athanasius* the Great, and published as such: namely, (1) *Sacrae Scripturae Synopsis*; (2) *Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Antiochum*; (3) the *two* tracts, *de Incarnatione Verbi Dei*; (4) *Syntagma doctrinae, ad Clericos et Laicos*; (5) *de Virginitate, sive Asceti*.

Zacharius, a rhetorician; flourished AD. 491. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History, from AD. 450—491; which is often quoted, as well as censured for partiality, by *Evagrius*, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

Eustathius, of Syria; flourished AD. 496. He wrote *Chronicorum Compendium*; from Aeneas to Anastasius or AD. 496; in ix Books; which are lost.

Malchus, a Byzantine sophist; flourished AD. 496. He composed a Roman History, from *Constantine* the Great, to the emperor Anastasius. Two large extracts, only, are extant.

Basil of Cilicia, first a presbyter at Antioch, and then bishop of Irenopolis in Cilicia; flourished AD. 497. He wrote an *Ecclesiastical History*, in iii Books; extending from AD. 450, to AD. 527: also, *contra Johannem Scythopolitanum*, Libri xvi, accusing him of manichaeism. Neither work is extant.

Candidus, a scrivener to the governors of the province of Isauria; flourished AD. 496. He wrote *Historiarum Libri* iii. extending from AD. 457, to AD. 491. Some extracts, by *Photius*, are all that remain.

Andreas, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia; flourished about AD. 500. He wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse; which is extant, Gr. and Lat. inter Opp. *Chrysostomi*, Tom. viii. ed. *Morell*.—also *Therapeutica Spiritualis*; of which only some fragments remain. Tr.]

(32) The entire works of *Leo I*, [comprising 100 Sermons, and 141 Epistles,] were edited with great care, by the celebrated presbyter of the Oratory, *Pasch. Quesnell*, Lyons, 1700, 2 vol. Fol. [This edition being proscribed by the pope, because the editor defended the cause of *Hilary* of Arles, and the liberties of the Gallican church, against *Leo*; a new edition was published by *Cacciari* and the brothers *Ballerini*.—*Leo* was a man of extraordinary talents, a good writer, an indefatigable bishop, and very successful in promoting the glory of the see of Rome. It has been said, that he possessed every virtue that was compatible with an unbounded ambition. He was bishop of Rome from AD. 440, to AD. 461. In the beginning of his reign, he persecuted the sectarians of Africa, who took refuge in Italy on the conquest of Africa by the Vandals. In 445 commenced his controversy with *Hilary* archbishop of Arles, whom he divested of his rights as a metropolitan, in violation of the liberties of the Gallican church. He also obtained from *Valentinian III*, a decree confirming his usurpations over the Gallic church. In 451, he showed the violence of his passions and the excess of his ambition, by his opposition to the decree of the council of Chalcedon, which raised the bishop of Constantinople to the rank of a patriarch, and extended very much his jurisdiction. In the year 455, he was a protection to the city of Rome, when it was pillaged by *Genserich*, king of the Vandals. See *M. Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xvii. p. 90—169; and *A. Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii. p. 7—140. Tr.]

his oral communications, his writings, and his institutions, instructed the Gauls in the mode of living pursued by the monks of Syria and Egypt; and was a leading teacher among those denominated Semi-Pelagians.(34) The *Homilies* of *Maximus* of Turin, which are still extant, are short, but generally neat and pious.(35) *Eucherius* of Lyons, is not the last among the Latins of this century, who treated moral subjects eloquently and well.(36) *Pontius* [*Paulinus*] of Nola, highly esteemed by the

(33) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionaire, Tome iii. voce *Orose*. The works of *Orosius* have at length been published, with some medals, by *Sigb. Havercamp*, Leyden, 1738, 4to.—[*Paul Orosius* was a presbyter of Tarragona in Spain. In the year 413, he was sent into Africa, to consult *Augustine* respecting the rising sect of the Priscillianists. *Augustine* now put him upon writing his history; which he completed four years afterwards. In the year 415, *Augustine* sent him to Palestine, to visit *Jerome*, and learn his opinion respecting the origin of souls. He was present at some councils in Palestine; and there opposed the errors of *Pelagius*. On his return to Africa, he brought with him the relics of St. *Stephen*, which were highly valued. He afterwards returned to Spain. The time of his death is unknown. His works, written in good Latin, comprise (1) *Historiarum adversus Paganos Libri vii*; in which he endeavors to show from the Roman history, that as great calamities had happened in the empire under the reign of paganism, as under that of christianity. (2) *Apologeticus contra Pelagianos de arbitrii libertate*. These two works are in the edition of *Havercamp*. (3) His written statement to *Augustine*, in the year 413, which is published among the works of *Augustine*, and is entitled, *Commonitorium sive consultatio ad S. Augustinum, de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*. Tr.]

(34) *Histoire litteraire de la France*, Tome ii. p. 215 &c. *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothéque Ecclesiast. par M. du Pin, Tome i. p. 156. The works of *Cassian*, with a prolix Commentary, were published by *Alard. Gazaeus*; latest ed. Francf. 1722. Fol.—[*John Cassianus*, of Scythian extract, was born at Athens AD. 351. He early devoted himself to a monastic life; which he pursued, first at Bethlehem, then at Nitria in Egypt, next at Constantinople, where *Chrysostom* made him deacon of a church. On the banishment of *Chrysostom*, AD. 404, the clergy of Constantinople sent *Cassianus* to Italy, to solicit aid to their cause from the Roman pontiff. At Rome, *Cassianus* was ordained a presbyter; and there he remained till AD. 410, when, on the capture of Rome by the Goths, he retired to Marseilles in France. Here he erected two monasteries, one for males, and one for females; and thenceforth devoted himself to the furtherance of monkery in Gaul. He commenced author in 424, and died AD. 448, aged 97 years. He was not a great man; but he was active, pious, and sincere. He was a leading man among the Semi-Pelagians; and held, perhaps, nearly the same sentiments respecting original sin, and grace, and human ability, with the Remonstrants or Arminians of Holland in the 17th century. His works are (1) *de Institutis Coenobiorum Libri xii*; of which the iv first Books describe the form and regulations of a monastery; and the viii following treat of as many principal sins. (2) *xxiv Collationes Patrum*; discourses or rather Colloquies, chiefly on monastic virtues. (3) *de Christi incarnatione adversus Nestorium Libri vii*. Tr.]

(35) [*Maximus* was bishop of Turin in Piedmont, from AD. 422, to AD. 466. Little is known of his life. His works consist of 85 short Homilies or Sermons. Of these 32 were published among the works of *Ambrose*; and 8 among the discourses of *Augustine*. *Theoph. Raynaud* collected and published 73 of them, under the name of the real author, in a volume containing the works of *Leo I.* and of *Peter Chrysologus*; Lyons 1652, and Paris 1671, Fol. Afterwards, *Mabillon* collected 12 more; which he published in his *Musaeum Italicum*, Tom. i. Pt. ii. p. 1 &c. And *Bruno Bruni*, published the whole, Rome. 1784. Fol. Tr.]

(36) Concerning *Eucherius*, the Benedictine monks treat largely, in *Histoire litteraire de la France*, Tome ii. p. 275. [He was of an honorable family in Gaul, fond of monkery in his youth, and resided some time in a monastery in the island Lerins. But he afterwards married, and had two sons, *Salonius* and *Verninus*, who became bishops. He was bishop of Lyons, from AD. 434, to AD.

ancients for his piety, has recommended himself to posterity by his poems, and by some other things.(37) *Peter*, bishop of Ravenna, acquired the surname of *Chrysologus* on account of his eloquence, and his discourses are not entirely destitute of genius.(38) *Salvianus* was an eloquent but a gloomy and austere writer, who in the vehemence of his declamation against the vices of the times, unwarily discloses the weaknesses and defects of his own character.(39) *Prosper* of Aquitain, (40) and *Marius*

454. His most admired work is his Epistle to Valerianus, *on contempt of the world and secular philosophy*. Besides this, he wrote in praise of monkery; instructions for his sons, and several Homilies. Several works are falsely ascribed to him. The whole were published, *Basil*, 1531, and *Rome* 1564, 4to. and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. vi. *Tr.*]

(37) See the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Tome ii. p. 179. The works of *Paulinus* were published by *J. Bapt. le Brun*, Paris, 1685, 2 vol. 4to. [See note (37) pa. 305, on the preceding century, where he is particularly described. *Tr.*]

(38) See *Agnelli*, *Liber Pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatensis*, Tom. i. p. 321. ed. *Bachinii*.—[*Peter Chrysologus* was an Italian, of a noble family. He was born at Imola, and educated under the bishop of that see. In the year 433, he was made bishop of Ravenna, where he died about AD. 450. He has left us 147 short Homilies or Sermons; and one Epistle, addressed to *Eutyches* the heretic, in the year 449. His works have been often published; the latest edition is, perhaps, that of *Venice* 1742, Fol. *Tr.*]

(39) See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Tome ii. p. 517. [“The authors of the history, here referred to, give a different account of *Salvian's* character. They acknowledge, that his declamation against the vices of the age, in his *Treatise against Avarice*, and his *Discourse concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement: but they represent him notwithstanding as one of the most humane and benevolent men of his time.” *Macl.*—*Salvian* was a native of Gaul, probably of Cologne; lived long at Treves, and married a pagan lady, who however became a christian after marriage; had one child, a daughter. At length he removed to the south of France, and became a presbyter of Marseilles, where he lived to a great age. He flourished as early as 440; but was alive, though an old man, in the year 495. See *Gennadius*, (who was a contemporary presbyter of Marseilles,) de *Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 67. The works of *Salvian*, now extant, are, (1) *On the Providence and Government of God, and his righteous temporal judgments*, viii Books. (2) *Nine Epistles*. (3) *Against Avarice, especially in clergymen and bishops*, iv Books. His style is barbarous, yet vivid and energetic. His conceptions are clear, his reasoning pungent, and his sentiments for the most part correct. Yet his descriptions are coarse and often too high colored, and his positions sometimes untenable. The works of *Salvian* have been often published. The best edition is that of *Steph. Baluze*, Paris, 1669, 8vo. *Tr.*]

(40) For a good account of *Prosper*, see the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 369.—[*Tiro Prosper*, a layman, but a learned theologian, of Aquitain in Gaul, flourished AD. 444. He was a great admirer and an able defender of the doctrines of *Augustine*, respecting original sin, predestination, and free grace. In the year 426, he addressed a letter to *Augustine*, acquainting him with the incipient progress of Pelagian errors in Gaul, and soliciting him to write against them. In 431, he visited Italy, to procure the aid of the Roman pontiff against these errors; and returned strengthened by a doctrinal letter addressed to the bishops of Gaul. In 433, he wrote his strictures on the 13th *Collatio* of *John Cassianus*, which is an able performance. In 443, *Leo I.* called him to Rome, and made him his private secretary, and employed him in the Pelagian contests of Italy. He was alive in 455; but the time of his death is unknown. He was a man of strong reasoning powers, soundly orthodox, and a good model in controversial writing. Most of his works are in defence of the doctrines of original sin, predestination, and free grace; and especially his two Books (if indeed they are

Mercator, (41) are well known to every one who has paid much attention to the Pelagian and other controversies of this century. *Vincentius* of Lirins has continued his name to posterity, by a short but elegant tract against the sects, which he entitled *Commonitorium*. (42) I designedly pass over *Sidonius Apollinaris*, a tumid writer, though not destitute of eloquence; (43) *Vigilius* of Tapsus; (44) *Arnobius* Junior, who commented on the Psalms

his,) *de Vocatione Gentium*, (on the offer of salvation to all men,) will be read with interest by the modern theologian. He also composed a *Chronicon*, continuing that of *Eusebius* down to AD. 455; a *Commentary* on the last 50 Psalms; several letters; and some poems. His works were published, Paris 1711. Fol. and by *Salina*, Rome, 1732, 8vo. *Tr.*]

(41) [*Marius Mercator*, was probably an African, yet may have lived sometime in Italy. He was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of *Augustine*, and an active defender of his doctrines from AD. 418, to the year 451. His works are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly *Nestorius*, *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, *Cyril* of Alexandria, *Proclus*, *Theodoret*, &c. accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. They are all designed to confute either the *Nestorian* or the *Pelagian* errors: and were edited with copious notes, by *Joh. Garnier*, Paris, 1673, Fol. and still better by *Steph. Baluze*, Paris, 1684, 8vo. *Tr.*]

(42) A good account of *Vincentius* of Lerins, is found in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 305. [He was born of a noble family, at *Toul* in the French Netherlands; became a soldier, and afterwards a monk at Lerins, where he was made a presbyter. He flourished AD. 434, and died before the year 450. He was probably a Semi-Pelagian; as may be inferred from his *Objections against the writings and doctrines of Augustine*, which (though lost) are confuted by *Prosper* of Aquitain. His only surviving work is his *Commonitorium adversus Hæreticos*. This he rewrote, but lost the copy, and therefore added notes to the first draft. It is an attempt to confute all heresies, at once, by showing what are the marks of the true church, as distinguished from all errorists. It has been often published; e. g. by *Baluze*, subjoined to *Salvian's* works, Paris, 1669, 8vo. and Cambridge, 1687. 12mo. *Tr.*]

(43) [*C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius* was born of a noble family at *Lyons* in France, AD. 431. His father and grandfather, both bore the name of *Apollinaris*, and both were praetorian prefects of the Gallias. After an expensive education, he became a soldier, married the daughter of *Aritus* who was afterwards emperor, had three children; was captured at the siege of Lyons, AD. 457; yet was advanced to honor, by the new Emperor *Majorianus*, whom he eulogized in 458; had a statue erected to him, and was advanced to the dignity of count. In the year 467, he went to Rome as legate from the city of Clermont; pronounced a eulogy on the emperor *Anthemius*; was made *prefect* of Rome, and performed his duties so faithfully that he had another statue decreed him, was made a *patri-cian* and a *senator* of Rome. In the year 472, he was almost compelled to accept the office of bishop of *Clermont* in France. He now laid aside all his civil honors, gave up his property to his son, and devoted himself to sacred studies and to his episcopal functions. His influence among the clergy and the churches, was very great. When the Goths attacked Clermont, he put himself at the head of the citizens, as their military commander; and when the city was captured, in 480, he retired in safety, was restored to his see, and died in the year 482. He has left us numerous Epistles, which he himself digested into nine Books; in which form they are published, with one Sermon, and 24 poetic effusions interspersed. Several of his works in prose and verse, are lost. His works were published by *Jac. Sirmond*, Paris, 1614, 8vo. and with additional notes, Paris, 1652, 8vo. His Epistles are useful, as throwing light on the history of his times. *Tr.*]

(44) *Vigilius*, bishop of *Tapsus* in Africa, flourished AD. 484, at which time he was summoned to appear at Carthage before *Huneric*, the Arian king of the Vandals, and give account of his faith. He boldly professed orthodoxy; but the persecution which followed, obliged him to quit Africa, and he retired to Constantinople, and after some years removed to Italy where he composed several

of David;(45) *Dracontius*;(46) and others;(47) who were of a secondary rank.

perhaps the greater part of his works. To conceal himself from his persecuting enemies, he composed much under borrowed names, and especially that of *Athanasius*. During the middle ages, he was confounded with *Vigilius* of Trent, who flourished at the beginning of this century. His works are, five Books against *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*; two Dialogues, between *Athanasius* and *Arius*, supposed to have been held at the council of Nice; three Dialogues between the same; twelve Books on the Trinity; a Dialogue on the Trinity, between *Augustine* and *Felicianus* an Arian; on the Trinity, against *Varimadus*; one Book against *Palladius*, an Arian; Answers to Arian objections; Dialogue between *Augustine* and *Pascentius*, an Arian. He is likewise supposed to be the author of that Confession of Faith, which is commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*. His works were first published as his by *P. F. Chifflet*, Dijon 1664, 4to. Tr.]

(45) An account of *Arnobius* junior, is given in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 342. [He is called *junior*, to distinguish him from the African *Arnobius*, who lived at the beginning of the preceding century. This *Arnobius junior*, is supposed to have lived in Gaul. He flourished about AD. 461, and wrote a Commentary on the Psalms; Notes on some passages in the Gospels; and a Dispute with *Serapion* of Egypt, respecting the Trinity, the person of Christ, and the consistency of grace with free will. He was a Semi-Pelagian. His works are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii. p. 203 &c. Tr.]

(46) [*Dracontius* was a presbyter and a poet, probably of Spain, who flourished AD. 440, and was alive in 450. He has left us a Heroic Poem on the Creation, or the Hexaemeron; and an Elegy on *Theodosius II*: both published by *J. Sirmond*, Paris 1619, 8vo; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ix. p. 724, 729. Tr.]

(47) [Catalogue of Latin writers omitted by *Dr Mosheim*, extracted from the *Historia Litteraria* of *Dr. Carr*.

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, a friend of *Ruffinus*, and a defender of *Chrysostom*; flourished AD. 401, and died 410. He has left us some Homilies on the beatitudes, Mat. v. and a few Epistles.

Innocent I. bishop of Rome AD. 402—417, a firm friend of *Chrysostom*, and strenuous against the *Nestorians* and *Pelagians*. Of 34 epistles published as his, the genuineness of nearly all, is questioned.

Zosimus, of Greek extract, bishop of Rome AD. 417—418; famous for his attempt to subject the African churches to his see. He has left us 13 epistles.

Boniface, bishop of Rome, AD. 418—423, prosecuted the attempt of *Zosimus*. We have 3 of his epistles.

Severus, bishop of Minorca, flourished AD. 418. His epistle, describing the conversion of the Jews of Minorca, was published by *Baronius*, *Annals*, ad ann. 418.

Julian, an Italian bishop, born before AD. 386, and died about the year 440 or 450. He studied under *Pelagius*; became a deacon, lector, husband, and bishop of a small town among the Hirpini. In the year 417, he came out an open defender of Pelagianism; in 420 he was condemned; went to Constantinople, and thence to Cilicia, where he lived long with *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, and devoted himself to writing in defence of his sentiments. In 423, he was condemned by a synod of Cilician bishops; returned to Italy in 424, hoping to recover his see; failed, and went again to Constantinople, to beg the interference of the emperor; but here *Mercator's* Commonitorium to *Theodosius II*, met him, and blasted his prospects. Being driven from Constantinople, and condemned in a council at Rome AD. 431, he pretended to renounce his errors, and applied to the Roman pontiff in 439, to restore him to his see; but in vain.—He was a man of superior talents, well acquainted with the scriptures, and so eloquent, that he was styled the *Roman Demosthenes*; and likewise famed for his piety and his benevolence to the poor. But he was accused of dissembling as to his sentiments, and of using bitter language towards his adversaries. Large extracts are preserved from his Epistles, his Commentary on the Canticles, and his twelve Books against the first and second Books of *Augustine* on marriage.

Priscus Fastidius, a British bishop, flourished AD. 420. He has left us a tract on a christian life and widowhood, addressed to a pious widow; extant among the works of *Augustine*, tom. ix.

Evodius, bishop of Uzala, in Africa, an intimate friend of *Augustine*, flourished AD. 420. Four of his Epistles to *Augustine*, and one Book de Fide contra Manichaeos, are extant, among the works of *Augustine*.

Isidorus, bishop of Cordova, in Spain, flourished AD. 420, and died AD. 430. He was probably the author of four Books of allegories, or commentaries on all the Books of Kings, extant among the works of *Isidorus Hispalensis*.

Caelestine, bishop of Rome AD. 423—432, and active in the Nestorian contests. He has left us 14 Epistles.

Lupus, bishop of Troyes in France, flourished AD. 427. He was sent by the Gallic bishops to Britain, in 429, to root out Pelagianism; was successful, and returned in 430; and died AD. 479. He has been pronounced one of the greatest men of his age. Two of his Epistles are extant.

Pisidius, or *Possidonius*, bishop of Calama, near Hippo in Africa; flourished AD. 430. He was an intimate friend of *Augustine*; and wrote his life, and a catalogue of his works, still extant among the works of *Augustine*.

Hilary, bishop of Arles, born AD. 401, became a monk of Lirins, and was made bishop in 430, and died in 449. As metropolitan of Arles, he deposed *Celidonius* bishop of Vienne; who appealed to Rome, and was supported by *Leo I*; which involved *Hilary* in war with *Leo* all their lives. He wrote the Life of St. Honoratus, his predecessor; Heroic Poems on Genesis; one Epistle to *Eucherius* of Lyons; two others to *Augustine*; and an account of the miracles of St. *Genesius*: all which were published by the Benedictines, Paris 1693, Fol. and by *Joh. Salina*, Rome 1731, 8vo.

Capreolus, bishop of Carthago, flourished AD. 431. His Epistle to the council of Ephesus, and another to the Spanish bishops, against Nestorius, are extant in *Baronius*, and in other Collections.

Patricius, (*St. Patrick*, the apostle of Ireland,) was born at *Nemthur*, (*Kirkpatrick*,) about the year 371; became a monk; was sent to Rome in 432, and there appointed apostle and archbishop of Ireland; returned to Ireland, and labored successfully; went to England in 447, obtained many fellow laborers, and returning, spread christianity far and wide in Ireland; he founded churches, ordained bishops, held councils, performed repeated miracles, and died AD. 493, aged 122 years. He is reported to have founded 365 churches, and to have ordained as many bishops, besides 3000 presbyters; and to have baptized 12000 souls. His life is given, in full, in archbishop *Usher's Ecclesiar. Britanica. Primordia*, cap. xvii. His works, consisting of epistles, canons, accounts of Irish synods, &c. were published (in part, by *Wilkins*, Concil. Britanic. tom. i. and) entire, by *Ja. Ware*, Lond. 1658, 8vo.

Sixtus III, bishop of Rome AD. 432—440. has left us several epistles. The iii Books on riches, chastity, false teachers &c. are erroneously ascribed to him.

Adrian, who lived perhaps about AD. 450, wrote an *Isagoge* (Introduction) in *S. Scripturam*; which is extant, in the *Critici Londinenses*, Tom viii.

Maximus, a Gallic monk, abbot of *Lerins* in 426, and bishop of *Riez* in France AD. 433, lived till 451 or longer, and wrote several *Homilies*, which are extant among those of *Eusebius* of Emesa, and *Eucherius* of Lyons.

Claudius Marius Victor, or *Victorinus*, a rhetorician and poet of Marseilles; flourished AD. 434, and died before AD. 450. He wrote a poetic commentary on *Genesis*, to the death of Abraham; a poetic epistle to the abbot *Solomon*, on the corrupt morals of the age; both extant, Paris 1560, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. viii. p. 580.

Caelius Sedulius, a Scotchman and poet, who flourished AD. 434. He studied in Italy, became a presbyter, and perhaps, a bishop. His works were collected, by *Tur. Ruf. Asterius*, towards the close of this century; comprising *Carmen Paschale*, (on the miracles of Christ,) in v Books; *Veteris et Novi Test. Collatio*, an Elegiac poem; *Paeon Alphabeticus de Christo*, in Iambic measure, (on the life of Christ;) and *Paschalis Operis Libri v.* in prose. An *Exposition of all the Epp. of Paul*, is falsely ascribed to him. The works of *Sedulius* have been published repeatedly; and are to be found in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi.

Valerianus, a bishop in the maritime Alps; flourished AD. 439, and was alive in 455. His 20 *Homilies* and an *Epistle*, were published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris 1612, 8vo. also, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tom. viii.

Eustathius, flourished AD. 440, the neat Latin translator of St. *Basil's* ix *Homilies* on the *Hexaëmeron*; extant among the works of *Basil the Great*.

Philippus, a presbyter, and disciple of *Jerome*; flourished AD. 440, and di-

ed AD. 455. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, in iii Books; published, Basil 1527, 4to. and Fol. It has been ascribed both to *Beda* and to *Jerome*.

Idatius, or *Hydatius*, a Spanish bishop who flourished AD. 445, and died AD. 468. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from AD. 379, to AD. 428; and afterwards continued it, to AD. 467: first published, intire, by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris 1619, 8vo; and since, in the works of *Sirmond*, Paris 1696, and Venice 1729. It is barbarous in style, and frequently inaccurate as to facts; yet affords valuable aid in tracing the movements of the Goths and Suevi.

Zachaeus, the reputed author of iii Books of discussion, between *Zachaeus* a christian, and *Apollonius* a pagan, in regard to christianity. The book was probably written, about AD. 450; and is published in *L. Dacherii*, *Spicilegium*, Tom. 10.

Salonius, son of *Eucherius* bishop of Lyons, and himself a Gallic bishop, flourished AD. 453. He wrote an *Exposition of the Parables of Solomon*; and a *mytical Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*; both extant, in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. viii.

Victorius or *Victorinus*, a Gallic mathematician; flourished AD. 457; author of a *Paschal Canon*, in two parts; the first part exhibits the principles and the method of calculating Easter; the second is a table of Easter days, from AD. 28, to AD. 457. This *Canon* was recommended by the council of Orleans AD. 541. and was first published by *Aegid. Bucherius*, Antw. 1634, Fol.

Hilary, bishop of Rome AD. 461—467. He was the bishop of Rome's legate to the council of Ephesus, in 449. Twelve of his *Epistles* are extant.

Paulinus Petricordius, or *Vesuntius*, (i. e. of Besançon,) a Gallic poet, who flourished AD. 461, and is often confounded with *Paulinus* of Nola. He wrote, *de Vita Sti Martini Libri* vi, an uninteresting poem, extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. vi. and published by *Daunius*, with notes, Lips. 1686, 8vo.

Claudius Mamertus, a Gallic poet, a presbyter, and assistant to the bishop of Vienne; flourished AD. 462. He wrote *de Statu Animi Libri* iii; two *Epistles*; a *Poem against various errors*; and a *Hymn on the crucifixion*; all extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. vii.

Simplicius, bishop of Rome AD. 467—483. He was much engaged in contests with the eastern patriarchs; and has left us 19 *Epistles*; extant in *Concilior.* Tom. iv.

Ruricius, senior, bishop of Limoges, in France; flourished AD. 470, but was alive in 506. He has left us ii Books of *Epistles*; published by *H. Canisius*, *Antiq. Lectiones*, Tom. v. (or Tom i. of new ed.) and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. viii.

Remigius, bishop of Rheims AD. 471—533. He baptized *Clovis*, king of the Franks, with many of his lords; was a man of note; and has left us five *Epistles*, together with his *Will*. The *Exposition* of Paul's *Epistles*, attributed to him, is not his.

Faustus, abbot of *Lerins*, and then bishop of *Riez*, in France, AD. 472—480 or 485; a Semi-Pelagian. His works are, *de Gratia Dei et libero Arbitrio, Libri* ii. with several *Sermons*, *Epistles* and *Tracts*; collected in *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. viii.

Felix, bishop of Rome AD. 483—492; was much in controversy with the eastern patriarchs. Fifteen of his *Epistles* are extant.

Victor Vitensis, an orthodox, African bishop, who fled to Constantinople, AD. 487; and there composed a *History of the persecutions in Africa*, under *Genserich* and *Hunneric*, kings of the Vandals. It was published, with *Optatus Milevitanus*, Paris 1569, 8vo; with *Vigilius Tapsensis*, Dijon 1664, 4to; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. viii.

Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, bishop of Clermont AD. 490—523. He has left us v. poetic Books, on the creation and fall of man, the flood, and the passage of the Red sea; a poem in praise of *Virginity*; 87 *Epistles*; and some *Sermons*; published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris 1643; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. ix.

Gelasius, bishop of Rome AD. 492—496. Sixteen of his *Epistles*, and fragments of various other works, are extant. The famous decree of a Roman council, AD. 494, *de Libris Canonicis, Ecclesiasticis, et Apocryphis*, ascribed to *Gelasius*, is of dubious authenticity.

Gennadius, a presbyter of Marseilles, flourished AD. 495; and wrote, *de Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, or a catalogue of authors, continuing *Jerome's* catalogue, from the year 393 to AD. 495. His Book *de Fide*, and his *Life of Jerome*, are

also extant. But his 8 Books against all the heresies, his 6 Books against *Nestorius*, his 3 Books against *Pelagius*, his Tract on the Millennium, and his translations from the Greek fathers, are lost.

Rusticus Elpidius, physician to *Theodoric*, king of the Goths; flourished about AD. 498: and has left 24 *Epigrams*, on scriptural facts; and a Poem on the Benefits of Christ.

Julianus Pomerius, of Mauritania; a teacher of rhetoric at Arles, and a presbyter there; flourished AD. 498. His viii Books *de Anima*, and several smaller works, are lost. But his iii Books, *de vita contemplativa*, are extant, among the works of *Prosper*; to whom they have been wrongly ascribed.

Symmachus, bishop of Rome AD. 498—514; famous for his excommunication of the emperor *Anastasius*; has left us 12 Epistles. Tr.]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1 Many points in theology better ascertained.—§ 2. Increase of superstition.—§ 3. Interpretation of the Scriptures.—§ 4. Most of the interpreters incompetent.—§ 5. Some were more able.—§ 6. State of dogmatic theology.—§ 7. Theological disputants.—§ 8. Their Faults.—§ 9. Hence, supposititious books.—§ 10. Moral writers.—§ 11. Mystics.—§ 12. Superstition of the Stylites.—§ 13. Further defects of the moralists.—§ 14. *Jerome's* controversy with *Vigilantius*.—§ 15. Controversies respecting *Origen*.

§ 1. In the controversies, which in this century agitated nearly all christendom, many points of theology were more fully explained and more accurately defined, than they had been before. Thus it was with the doctrine concerning *Christ*, his person and natures; and those concerning the innate depravity of the human soul, the natural ability of men to live and act as the law of God requires, the necessity of divine grace in order to salvation, human liberty, and the like. For that devout and venerable simplicity of the first ages of the church, which taught men to believe when God speaks, and to obey when God commands, appeared to most of the doctors of this age, to be unphilosophical and becoming only in the vulgar. Many of those however, who attempted to explain and illustrate these doctrines, guided men rather into litigations, than to a rational faith and a holy life; for they did not so much explain, as involve in greater obscurity, and darken with ambiguous terms and incomprehensible distinctions, the deep mysteries of revealed religion. And hence arose abundant matter for difficulties, contentions, and animosities, which flowed down to succeeding ages, and which can scarcely be removed by the efforts of human power. It hardly need be remarked, that some, while pressing their adversaries, incautiously fell into the opposite errors, which were no less dangerous.

§ 2. The superstitious notions and human devices, by which religion was before much clogged, were very considerably augmented. The aid of departed saints was implored with supplications, by vast multitudes; and no one censured this absurd devotion. Nor did the question, which afterwards occasioned much debate, namely, in what way the prayers of mortals could reach the ears of residents in heaven, present any difficulties to the christians of those times. For they did not suppose the souls of departed saints to be so confined to the celestial mansions, as not to have liberty of paying visits to mortals at their pleasure, and of travelling over various regions of the earth. These unembodied

spirits were supposed very frequently to visit, and to be much attached to, the places where their bodies were buried. And this opinion, derived to christians from the Greeks and Romans, drew a great conflux of supplicants to the sepulchres of the saints.(1) The images of those who were in reputation for sanctity while alive, were now honored with extraordinary devotion in several places; and there were those who believed, what the pagan priests had maintained respecting the statues of *Jupiter* and *Mercury*,(2) namely, that those inhabitants of heaven kindly afforded their presence in these their images. The bones of martyrs, and the sign of the cross, were supposed to be the most sovereign remedy against the assaults of demons, and all other calamities; and to have power, not only to heal diseases of the body, but likewise those of the mind.(3) On the public processions, the holy pilgrimages,(4) the superstitious services paid by the living to the souls of the dead, the multiplication and extravagant veneration of temples, chapels, and altars, and innumerable other proofs of degenerate piety, I forbear to speak particularly. As no one in those times objected to christians' retaining the opinions of their pagan ancestors, respecting the soul, heroes, demons, temples, and the like, and their transferring them into their devotions; as no one proposed utterly to abolish the ancient pagan institutions, but only to alter them somewhat, and purify them; it was unavoidable, that the religion and the worship of christians should in this way become corrupted. This also I will add, that the doctrine of the purification of souls after death by means of some sort of fire, which afterwards became so great a source of wealth to the clergy, obtained in this age, a fuller developement and greater influence.(5)

§ 3. The number of those who devoted their talents to the explanation of the scriptures, was not so great as in the preceding century, when there was less of controversy among christians;

(1) *Lactantius*, *Divinar. Instit.* Lib. i. p. 164. *Hesiod*, *Opp. et Dier.* v. 122. With which compare *Sulpitius Severus*, *Epist.* ii. p. 371. *Dial.* ii. c. 13. p. 474. *Dial.* iii. p. 512. *Aeneas Gazaeus*, *Theophrastus*, p. 65. *Macarius*, in *Ja. Tollii Insignia itineris Italici*, p. 197, and other writers of that age.

(2) *Clementina*, *Homil.* x. in *Patr. Apostol.* Tom. i. p. 697. *Arnobius*, *adv. Gentes*, Lib. vi. p. 254 &c. *Casp. Barthius*, *ad Rutilium Numantian.* p. 250.

(3) *Prudentius*, *Hymn.* xi. de *Coronis*, p. 150, 151. *Sulpitius Severus*, *Epist.* i. p. 364. *Aeneas Gazaeus*, *Theophrastus*, p. 173. ed. Barth.

(4) [These pilgrimages were then so common, that some christians fell into absurdities truly ridiculous. They journeyed quite to Arabia, in order to see the dung hill on which the diseased *Job* sat, and to kiss the ground which had absorbed his precious blood; as *Chrysostom* describes it, (*Homily v. to the Antiochians*,) where he says, in his rhetorical way, that the dung hill of *Job* was more venerable than the throne of a king. *Schl.*]

(5) On this subject, *Augustine* deserves especially to be consulted, *de octo quaestionibus ad Dulcitium Liber*, c. xiii. *Opp.* Tom. vi. p. 128. *de fide et operibus*, c. xvi. p. 182. *de fide, spe et caritate*, § 118. p. 222. *Exposition of Psalm xxxv*, § iii. &c.

and yet the number was not small. I merely name such as expounded only one or a few books of scripture, namely, *Victor* of Antioch, *Polychronius*, *Philo* of Carpathus, *Isidore* of Cordova, *Salonius*, and *Andreas* of Cesarea. The two most distinguished interpreters of this century, and who explained a great part of the sacred volume, and not altogether without success, were *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, and *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia. Both possessed genius and learning, and would not follow in the footsteps of those who preceded them, without some reason. The expositions of the former are before the public ;(6) those of the latter lie concealed in the East, among the Nestorians, and are worthy for various reasons to see the light.(7) *Cyril* of Alexandria deserves a place among the interpreters ; but a far more honorable one is due to *Isidore* of Pelusium, whose epistles contain much that tends to elucidate and explain the holy scriptures.(8)

§ 4. Most of these interpreters, whether Greeks or Latins, every where copy after *Origen* ; and despising the genuine and obvious meaning of the scriptures, search after abstruse senses, or what the Latins of that age called *mysteries*, in the plainest passages and sentences of the bible. Some of the Greeks indeed, and in particular *Theodoret*, labored not unsuccessfully in explaining the pages of the New Testament : which we may ascribe to their acquaintance with the Greek language, with which they had been familiar from their infancy. But upon the Hebrew scriptures, neither the Greeks nor the Latins cast much light. Nearly all who attempted to explain them, making no use of their judgment, applied the whole either to *Christ* and his benefits, or to *Anti-Christ* and his wars and desolations, and to the kindred subjects.

§ 5. Here and there one, however, more sagacious and wiser than the rest, ventured to point out a safer path. This is evident from the Epistles of *Isidore* Pelusiota, who in various places, censures in a pertinent manner those who, disregarding the *historic* sense, referred all the narrative and prophetic parts of the Old Testament to *Christ* : and yet he himself was by no means entirely free from the fault of his age, the love and pursuit of allegories. No one went further in censuring the imitators of *Origen*, than *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia. He not only wrote a book *concerning allegory and history against Origen* ;(9) but also in his own

(6) See *Rich. Simon*, Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. Test. cap. xxii. p. 314. and Critique de la Bibliothéque Ecclesiast. de M. du Pin, Tome i. p. 180. [and note (22) p. 391. above. Tr.]

(7) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana, Tom. iii. § ii p. 227. *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. par M. du Pin, Tome i. p. 108, 677. [See also note (26) p. 393, above. Tr.]

(8) Concerning both, see *Rich. Simon*, Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du N. Test. c. xxi. p. 300 &c. [For some account of *Cyril*, see note (21) p. 390. and concerning *Isidore*, note (23) p. 391, above. Tr.]

(9) *Facundus Hermianensis*, de tribus capitulis, Lib. iii. c. 6. *Liberatus*, Breviarium, c. xxiv.

Commentaries on the Prophets of the Old Testament, ventured to explain most of their predictions with reference to events in ancient history.(10) And this his method of explaining the Old Testament, perhaps, raised as much ill will against him, as those other sentiments which brought on him the charge of heresy. The example of this excellent man, was followed especially by the Nestorians;(11) nor have they yet ceased to follow it, for they preserve his books with care, and venerate him as a saint of the highest order.

§ 6. It is very evident, that the doctrines of religion were not exhibited with sufficient purity and simplicity, by most persons; but they were sometimes, with uncommendable zeal, drawn out beyond the limits which divine revelation assigns to them; were anatomized with too much art and subtilty; and were substantiated, not so much by the declarations of the holy scriptures, as by the authority and reasonings of the ancient doctors. I know of no one who embraced a complete system of Christian doctrines in a single work, unless *Nicaeus* of Romacia may be considered as doing this, in the *six Books of instruction for Neophytes* which he is said to have composed.(12) But it has been already observed, that various doctrines of religion were laboriously explained, especially in the controversial works against the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

§ 7. Of controversial writers, a great number can be mentioned: and indeed many of this description were required by the many contests that existed. The worshippers of the pagan images and gods, were vigorously assailed by *Theodoret*, in his book, *De curandis Græcorum affectionibus*, which displays much genius and erudition; by *Orientius*, in his *Commonitorium*; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Disputation* between *Zachæus* and *Apolonius*.(13) To these may be added *Philip* of Side and

(10) *Acta Concilii Constantinop. ii. seu Oecumenici v. in Tom. iii. p. 58. Concilior. ed. Harduin.*

(11) One witness, among others, is *Cosmas Indicopleustes*, a writer of the 6th century, who is known to have been a Nestorian. For he says, in his *Topographia*, lib. v. (p. 224, 225. of the *Collectio nova Patrum Græcor.* published by *Bernh. Montfaucon*.) “Among all the Psalms of David, only *four* refer to *Christ* :” and to confirm this sentiment, he does not hesitate to declare, (p. 227.) “That the writers of the New Testament, when they apply the prophecies of the Old Testament to *Jesus Christ*, follow the *words* rather than the *sense*.” [See also *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 880. *Tr.*]

(12) *Gennadius Massiliens. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiast. cap. 22. p. 14. ed. Fabric.* [The work is lost; but, from the account of *Gennadius*, it was no *System of Theology*. *Tr.*]

(13) For an account of *Orientius* and *Evagrius*, see the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 121 and 252. [*Orientius*, called also *Orontius*, and *Orcsius*, was bishop of *Aux* in France, perhaps also of *Tarragona* in Spain. His *Commonitorium*, which is written in heroic verse, was published, Book I. by *Martin Delrio*, Antwerp 1600, and Book II. by *Edm. Martene*, in his *Nova Collectio operum ecclesiast. vet.* Paris 1700.—This *Evagrius* is not the noted *Evagrius Scholasticus*, of the 6th century, but was a French priest, and a disciple of *St.*

Philostorgius; of whom the former wrote against *Julian*, and the latter against *Porphyry*.(14) The Jews were confuted, by *Basil* of Seleucia;(15) by *Gregentius*, in his *Disputation with Herbanus*; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Dialogue between Theophilus and a Jew*. Against all the heretics, something was attempted by *Voconius*, an African; by *Syagrius*, in his tract *de Fide*; by *Gennadius* of Marseilles; and, best of all, by *Theodoret*,(16) in his work *de Fabulis Haereticorum*. Those who attacked only individual sects, are here omitted.

§ 8. Such of these as contended against the christian sectarists, followed the rules of the ancient sophists, and also, (what is truly surprising,) the practice of the Roman courts, rather than the examples and instructions of *Christ* and his apostles. In the Roman courts, very difficult and doubtful points were decided according to the opinions of certain ancient jurists. If these happened to disagree, that opinion was preferred which was maintained by the greatest number, or by the jurists of most learning and reputation.(17) It was very prejudicial to the interests of truth, that this usage of the Roman courts was adopted as a rule in the controversies of christians on subjects of religion, and followed in the deliberations of the councils of this century. For by it, *that* was sanctioned and regarded as confirmed, which had been judged true and certain, by the major part, or by the most learned and distinguished, of the doctors of former times. This appears from nearly all the Acts of Councils now extant. The other faults of the theological disputants, may be easily inferred from what has now been stated.

§ 9. This imitation of the practice of the Roman courts in the management of religious controversies, contributed greatly to inflame the base audacity of those, who did not blush to palm their own spurious productions on the great men of former times, and even on *Christ* himself, and his apostles; so that they might be able, in the councils and in their books, to oppose names against names, and authorities against authorities. The whole christian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with these disgraceful fictions. And this, it is said, occasioned the Roman pontiff, *Gelasius*, to assemble at Rome a convention of bishops from the whole empire, and after examining the books which were pro-

Martin. His *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*, is found in *Martene's Anecdota*; and his *Consultationes, seu Deliberationes Zachaei Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi*, is in the *Spicilegium* of *D'Archery*, tom. x. *Schl.*]

(14) [Neither of the works here mentioned is extant. *Tr.*]

(15) [For some account of this *Basil*, and of his writings, see note (28) p. 393, above. *Tr.*]

(16) [An account of *Theodoret*, and of his writings, is given in note (22) p. 391 above. *Tr.*]

(17) See *Codex Theodosianus*, Lib. i. Tit. iv. de responsis prudentum, p. 32. ed. *Ritter*.

fessedly the works of persons of the highest authority, to draw up that famous decree, by which so many *apocryphal* books are stripped of their false reputation. That something of this kind was actually done, cannot well be denied; but men of superior learning maintain, that this pretended Decree of *Gelasius* is of no better authority, than those books which it condemns; that is, they believe that it was not the production of *Gelasius*, but of some one who abused his name.(18)

§ 10. Among those who treated on the subject of morals, *Eucherius*, *Salvian*, and *Nilus*, stand conspicuous. The epistle of *Eucherius* especially, on *Contempt of the world and secular philosophy*, will recommend itself to every good man, both by its style and its matter. The short pieces of *Mark*, the hermit, breathe a spirit of piety; but do not afford pleasure, either by the selectness of the matter, the justness of the arrangement, or the solidity of the reasoning. *Fastidius* composed various Tracts concerning moral duties and virtues, which are all lost, [except his Tract on a *Christian Life and widowhood*, addressed to a pious widow; which is preserved among the works of *Augustine*, Tom. ix. Tr.] The productions in this department of *Diadochus*, *Prosper*, and *Severianus*, are interesting, with a few exceptions, for the truth and terseness of the thoughts; but will afford little satisfaction to one fond of solid argumentation and well digested composition. Indeed it was a fault common to nearly all the moral writers of those times, that they had no ideas of a regular distribution of their subject into parts, or of tracing it back to its first principles.

§ 11. This fault might indeed be put up with, and be ascribed to the infelicity of the times, by the more candid; but we see other injuries done to the cause of piety by inconsiderate men. In the first place, the *mystics*, as they are called, who pretended to be more perfect than other christians, drew many every where among the weak and thoughtless, and especially in the eastern provinces, who were allured by the appearance of their extraordinary and self-denying piety, to become of their party. And it is incredible, what rigorous and severe laws they imposed on themselves; in order to appease God, and deliver the *celestial spirit* from the bondage of this *mortal body*. To live among

(18) *Jo. Pearson*, *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, Pt. I. c. iv. p. 189 &c. *Wm. Cave*, *Historia Litter. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* p. 260. *Urb. Godofr. Siberus*, *Praef. ad Enchiridion Sexti*, p. 79. and others. [This Decree is ascribed, by most of the MSS. to *Gelasius I*; but by some to *Damasus*, and by others to *Hormisdas*. It is not quoted by any writer, before the 9th century: It mentions some books, which were not in being, in the age of *Gelasius*. And it contains some sentiments and arguments, which savor of a later age.—It may be found in perhaps all the larger Collections of Councils; in *Binnius*, vol. ii. in *Labbé*, vol. iv. in *Harduin*, vol. ii. in *Mansi*, Supplem. vol. i. also in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, *Decret Gratian*, Pt. I. Distinct. xv. cap. iii. Tr.]

wild beasts,—nay in the *manner* of these beasts; to roam about like mad men, in desert places, and without garments; to feed their emaciated bodies with hay and grass; to shun the converse and even the sight of men; to stand motionless in certain places, for many years, exposed to the weather; to shut themselves up in confined cabins, till life ended;—this was accounted piety; this, the true method of eliciting the [spark of] Deity from the secret recesses of the soul.(19) The greater part of these people were influenced, not so much by arguments and assignable reasons, as by either a natural propensity to melancholy and austerity, or by the example and opinions of others. For there are diseases of the mind, as well as of the body, which can spread like a pestilence. Yet there were some, who gave systematic precepts for this austere mode of living; for instance, among the Latins, *Julianus Pomerius*, in his three Books *de vita contemplativa*; and among the Syrians, many; whose names it would be needless to mention.

§ 12. Among these examples of religious fatuity, none acquired greater veneration and applause, than those who were called *Pillar-Saints* (*Sancti Columnares*,) or in Greek, *Stylites*; persons of a singular spirit and genius, who stood motionless on the tops of lofty columns, during many years, and to the end of life, to the great astonishment of the ignorant multitude. The author of this institution in the present century, was *Simeon* of Sisan, a Syrian; who was first a shepherd, and then a monk; and who, in order to be nearer heaven, spent thirty seven years in the most uncomfortable manner, on the tops of five different pillars, of six, twelve, twenty two, thirty six, and forty cubits elevation: and in this way, procured for himself immense fame and veneration.(20) His ex-

(19) See *Moschus*, *Pratum spirituale*; *Palladius*, *Historia Lausiaca*; *Sulpitius Serenus*, *Dial.* i. and others.

(20) See the *Acta Sanctor.* for the month of January, tom. i. p. 261 &c. where is expressly stated, (pa. 277,) the very reason I have mentioned, for his living in this manner. *Theodoret* also indicates the same, by saying that *Simeon* desired gradually to increase the altitude of his pillar, that he might get nearer to heaven. *Tillemont*, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. xv. p. 347. ed. Paris. The *Acta S. Simeonis Stylitæ*, are most fully related, in *Steph. Evod. Asseman's Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.* vol. ii. p. 227. Rome 1748, Fol.—[This *Simeon*, we are told, was born at *Sisan* in Syria, about A.D. 390. At the age of 13, while tending his father's sheep, he heard a public exposition of Lu. vi. 21, 25. ("Blessed are ye that weep now &c. But wo unto you that laugh now &c.") which determined him to become a monk. Having therefore passed a novitiate of two years, he removed to a monastery near Antioch, where he lived 10 years. Here his abstinence and his voluntary mortifications were so excessive, as to draw on him censure from the other monks. He once swathed himself, from his loins to his neck, with a rigid well rope of palm, during 10 days; which caused his whole body to fester and discharge blood. Being expelled the monastery for such austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, and let himself down into a dry cave. After five days, the repenting monks sought him out, drew him forth from the cavern, and restored him to their fellowship. But not long after, he retired to a little cell, at the foot of a mountain near Antioch, and there immured himself three years. During this period, having caused his deft

ample was afterwards followed, though not fully equalled, by many persons in Syria and Palestine; who were led to it either by their ignorance of true religion, or by their love of fame: and this stupid form of religion continued in the East, quite down to the 12th century; when, at length, it was entirely abolished.(21)

The Latins had wisdom enough, not to copy after the Syrians and orientals in this matter: and when one *Wulfilaicus* built himself such a pillar in the German territory of Treves, and wished to live upon it in the manner of *Simeon*, the neighboring bishops pulled it down, and forbid the man from pursuing his object.(22)

§ 13. Those who undertook to give religious instruction to the less advanced in christian knowledge, were at more pains to inculcate and recommend the external signs of religion and exercises of the body, than to promote that real holiness which has its seat in the soul. In this respect, many were so excessively rigorous, as to require an extreme of *austere virtue*, little short of the senseless

to be stopped up with earth, he remained buried for 40 days, without eating or drinking; and when disinterred was found nearly dead. So pleased was he with this experiment, that he afterwards kept such a fast annually, as long as he lived. He next removed to the top of the mountain; where he chained himself to a rock, for several years. His fame had now become very great; and crowds of admiring visitors, of all ranks and characters, thronged around him. He instructed them, healed their diseases, and converted heretics, pagans, and Jews, in great numbers. Incommoded by the pressure of the crowd, he erected a pillar, on which he might stand; elevated, at first, six cubits; then, 12, 22, 36; and at last 40 cubits. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a ballustrade. Here he stood, day and night, and in all weathers. Through the night, and till 9 A. M. he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands, and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bye-stander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations; and he counted, till they amounted to 1244. At 9 o'clock A. M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters &c. for he took concern in the welfare of all the churches, and corresponded with bishops and even with emperors. Towards evening he suspended his intercourse with this world; and betook himself again to converse with God, till the following day. He generally ate but once a week; never slept; wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long; and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner, he is reported to have spent 37 years; and at last, in his 69th year, to have expired unobserved, in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him, till after three days; when *Antony*, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit was departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odor. His remains were borne, in great pomp, to Antioch; in order to be the safeguard of that unwall'd town: and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated, that it was literally enclosed with chapels and monasteries, for some ages. *Simeon* was so averse from women, that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege, till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him; and he now restored her to life, for a short time, that she might see him and converse with him a little, before she ascended to heaven.—Such is the story, gravely told us by the greatest writers of that age; and as gravely repeated, in modern times, by the Catholic Historians. Tr.]

(21) See *Urb. Godofr. Siber*, Diss. de Sanctis Columnaribus, Lips. 4to. and *Carol. Majell*, Diss. de Stylitis; in *Asseman's Acta Martyr. Orient. et Occident.* tom ii. p. 246. where there is a copperplate of *Simeon's* pillar.

(22) *Gregory Turonens.* Historia Francor. Lib. viii. c. xv. p. 387 &c.

piety of the *mystics*. According to the sentiments of *Salvian* and others, no one can become truly and perfectly holy, unless he abandons altogether his property and honors, contemns matrimony, banishes all hilarity from his mind, and subjects his body to a variety of mortifications and painful sensations. As there were few who could bear the severity of these rules, the veneration for those senseless or fanatical persons, those religious maniacs, to whose temperament these rules were adapted; increased marvellously; and saints sprung up like mushrooms.

§ 14. Some few dared to cut the roots of the growing superstition, and to recall men from vain and fictitious piety, to that which is genuine. But these were soon bidden to hold their peace, by others who were more numerous, in higher reputation, and possessed of greater influence.(23) An example we have in *Vigilantius*, a presbyter, of Gallic extract, but resident in Spain, a learned and eloquent man. After a journey to Palestine and Egypt, returning home near the beginning of this century, he issued several tracts, in which he taught and inculcated many things contrary to the opinions of the age. Among other things, he denied, that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs were worthy of any religious worship; and therefore, he censured pilgrimages, undertaken to places accounted sacred: he ridiculed the miracles, which were said to take place in the temples consecrated to the martyrs; and condemned the practice of keeping vigils in these temples: he said, that the custom of burning wax candles in the day time, at the sepulchres of the martyrs, was imprudently borrowed by christians from the ancient superstition of the pagans: he maintained, that prayers, addressed to departed saints, were fruitless: he treated with contempt the [prevailing] fasts, the celibacy of the clergy, and the monastic life: and he maintained, that such as distributed all their goods among the poor, in order to live in voluntary poverty, and such as sent portions of their property to Jerusalem, did not perform an act which was pleasing and acceptable to God. These sentiments were not offensive to several of the Gallic and Spanish bishops. But the most renowned monk of that age, *Jerome*, attacked this bold religious reformer with so much acrimony, that he readily saw he must be silent, if he would regard his life and safety. This effort, therefore, to check the reigning superstition, was crushed in its commencement.(24) The good man's name still remains in the lists

(23) *Augustine* himself complains of this, in his noted *Epistle* cxix, *ad Januarium*.

— (24) *Peter Bayle*, *Dictionnaire historique*, Article, *Vigilantius*, *Jean Barbeyrac*, *de la Morale des Peres*, p. 252. *Gerh. Joh. Vossius*, *Theses Historico-Theologicæ*, p. 170. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Tome ii. p. 57 &c. [That *Vigilantius* was an honest and correct theologian, and that his name ought to be erased from the list of *heretics*, appears highly probable, from a candid examination of the whole subject. See *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol.

of *heretics*, which are recognized by those who follow, not their own judgment or the decision of the holy scriptures, but the decisions of antiquity.

§ 15. The contests, moved in Egypt near the close of the preceding century, respecting *Origen*, were in this century prosecuted at the court of Constantinople, with little of either prudence or decency. The monks of Nitria, who were banished from Egypt, on account of *Origen*, took refuge at Constantinople; and were treated by *John Chrysostom*, the bishop of that city, with candor and kindness. As soon as this was known by *Theophilus* of Alexandria, he began to plot against *Chrysostom*; and sending the renowned *Epiphanius* with several other bishops to Constantinople, he endeavored to deprive that most eloquent prelate of his office. The time was a favorable one for his purpose; for *Chrysostom*, by the strictness of his discipline and by the severity with which he lashed the vices of the times and particularly those of some ladies of the court, had incurred the most violent resentment of many, and especially of *Eudoxia*, the wife of *Arcadius* the emperor. *Eudoxia* therefore, being enraged, invited *Theophilus* and the Egyptian bishops to come to Constantinople, assemble a council, and enquire into the religious sentiments, the morals, and the official conduct of *Chrysostom*. This council, which was held in the suburbs of Chalcedon in the year 403, and had *Theophilus* for its president, declared *Chrysostom* unworthy of the episcopal office, among other causes, on account of his too great attachment to *Origen* and the followers of *Origen*; and therefore decreed his banishment. The people of Constantinople, who were exceedingly attached to their bishop, became tumultuous, and impeded the execution of this unjust sentence. But the tumult subsiding, the same judges, the next year, AD. 404, in order to gratify their own enmity and that of *Eudoxia*, renewed their sentence, under another pretext; and *Chrysostom* surrendering himself to his enemies, went into banishment at *Cucusus*, a city of Cilicia; where he died, three years after.⁽²⁵⁾ His departure was followed by a great insurrection of the *Johannists*, (for so his partizans were called,) which the edicts of *Honorius* with difficulty suppressed.⁽²⁶⁾ That the proceedings against *Chrysostom* were most unjust, no one doubts; yet it was a fault in him, that he determined to avail himself of the elevation de-

iii. p. 673—704. and *Vogel's* Disputation before Dr. *Walch*, Gottingen 1756, de *Vigilantio haeretico orthodoxo*. Tr.]

(25) See the authors referred to in the preceding century; to whom add the writers on the Life of *Chrysostom*, viz. *Tillemont*, *Hermont*, and others: and *Nouveau Dictionnaire historique et crit.* Tome i. 79, 80. [See also note (17) p. 292, above; and *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.* L. vi. c. 9—18. *Sozomen*, H. E. Lib. viii. c. 13—22. Tr.]

(26) See his three Laws, with the notes of *Godefroi*, in the *Codex Theodosianus* Tom. v. p. 83, 113 &c.

creed to the bishops of his see, by the council of Constantinople, and to assume the prerogatives of a *judge* in the contest between *Theophilus* and the monks; which greatly exasperated the Alexandrine prelate. The monks of Nitria, having lost their patron, sought a reconciliation with *Theophilus*: but the *Origenist* party still continued to flourish in Egypt, Syria, and the neighboring countries, and made Jerusalem the centre and rendezvous of the sect.(27)

(27) See *Cyrilli Vita Sabae*, in *Cotelier*, Monumenta eccles. Graecae, Tom. ii. p. 274. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana, Tom. ii. p. 31 &c.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1. Rites greatly augmented.—§ 2. General description of them.—§ 3. Love-feasts. Penitence.

§ 1. To recount all the regulations made in this century, respecting the mode of worship, and religious rites and institutions, would require a volume of considerable size. The curious in these matters are referred to the Acts of the councils, and to the works of the principal writers of those times. There were some however among these writers, who were not so corrupted by the bad examples of their age, but that they could acknowledge that true piety in the soul was oppressed by that enormous load of ceremonies. This evil originated, in part, from the degeneracy and indolence of the teachers; in part, from the calamities of the times, which were unfavorable to mental cultivation; and in part, from the innate depravity of man, which disposes him more readily to offer to God the service of his limbs and his eyes, than of his heart.

§ 2. Public worship, every where, assumed a form more calculated for shew and for the gratification of the eye. Various ornaments were added to the sacerdotal garments; to increase the veneration of the people for the clerical order. The new forms of hymns, prayers, and public fasts, could not easily be enumerated. In Gaul, particularly, were instituted the *Rogations*, or public fasts and supplications, which precede [*Holy Thursday*] the festal day of *Christ's* ascension.(1) In some places it was appointed, that the praises of God should be sung perpetually, day and night, the singers succeeding each other without interruption;(2) as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in clamor and

(1) See *Sidonius Appollinaris*, Epist. Lib. v. Ep. 16. and Lib. vi. Ep. 1. *Martene*, Thesaurus Anecdotor. Tom. v. p. 47. [The three days immediately preceding Ascension day, that is Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, it is said, were first observed as days of public fasting, with solemn processions and supplications, by order of *Claudius Mamertus*, bp. of Vienne, in a time of great public calamity. Whether this was in the year 452, or 463, or 474, writers are not agreed. But the thing met approbation, was imitated, and repeated, till at length it became a law in the Latin church, that these days should be so observed, to secure a blessing on the fruits of the earth, and the temporal interests of men. The three days were called *Rogation Days*, and the week, *Rogation Week*, and the Sunday preceding, *Rogation Sunday*; from the *Rogations* or *Litanies* chanted in the processions on these days. Tr.]

(2) *Gervais*, Histoire de Segur, Tome i. p. 23. [This custom probably originated in the East. There, in the beginning of the 5th century, one *Alexander* established, under the auspices of *Gennadius*, the patriarch of Constantinople, the

noise, and in the flatteries of men. The magnificence of the temples had no bounds.(3) Splendid images were placed in them; and among these, after the Nestorian contests, the image of the virgin *Mary* holding her infant in her arms, occupied the most conspicuous place. Altars, and repositories for relics, made of solid silver, if possible, were procured in various places; from which may easily be conjectured, what must have been the splendor and the expense of the other sacred utensils.

§ 3. On the contrary, the *Agapae* or Love-Feasts were abolished; because, as piety diminished gradually and continually, these feasts gave to many persons, occasions for sin.(4) Among the Latins, grievous offenders, who before had to confess their sins in public, were relieved from this unpleasant duty; for *Leo* the Great gave them liberty to confess their crimes privately, to a priest selected for that purpose. In this way the ancient discipline, the sole barrier against shameful and indecent conduct, was removed; and the actions of men were subjected to the scrutiny of the clergy, which was greatly for their interest.(5)

Order of *Acoemetae* (ἀκοιμητοί) or the *Sleepless*; who so regulated their worship, that it was never interrupted, by day or by night; one class of the brethren succeeding another, continually. This order obtained afterwards the name of *Studites*; from a rich Roman counsellor of the name of *Studius*, who went to Constantinople, and erected a cloister appropriately for this Order. *Schl.*]

(3) See an example, in *Zacharias* of Mitylene, de Opificio Mundi, p. 165, 166.

(4) [The abolition of the Love-Feasts was, in part, effected in the 4th century. The council of Laodicea, Canon 28, first ordained, that they should no longer be held in the churches. A similar decree was passed, in the year 397, by the third council of Carthage, Canon 20. [30.] Yet the custom was too firmly established, to be at once rooted out. Hence we find, that in the times of *Augustine*, Love-Feasts were still kept in the churches. (*Augustine*, contra Faustum, L. xx. c. 20, 21. Confess. L. vi. c. 2. and Epist. lxiv.) Yet he there informs us, that all kinds of feasting had been excluded from the church by *Ambrose*. In the Gallic churches, Love-Feasts were prohibited by the council of Orleans, AD. 541. and, as here and there some relics of them appeared in the 7th century, the council in *Trullo* [AD. 692. Can. 74] was induced to confirm the canon of the Laodicean council, by annexing the penalty of excommunication. *Schl.*]

(5) [That the strictness of the ancient discipline was greatly relaxed, admits no question. But that all public testimony against particular offenders, all public penances, and public censures, were commuted for *private* confession before priests, and for *private* penances, (as *Dr. Mosheim* seems to intimate,) is contrary to the voice of history. All *public* offenders, and all such as were *proved* guilty of gross crimes, were still liable to *public* censures. But the ancient practice of *voluntary* confession, before the church, of *private* offences and *secret* sins, had for some time gone into desuetude. Instead of such confessions before the church, in most places both of the East and the West, these *voluntary* confessions were made only to a priest, in private; and he directed the persons to such a course, as he deemed proper. In some churches, however, in Campania and the vicinity, the practice was, for the priests to write down these voluntary disclosures, and if the persons were directed to do penance, their confessions were also read in public. It was to correct this *public* disclosure of *voluntary* confessions, that *Leo* I, in the year 460, wrote the Epistle to the bishops of Campania, Picenum, and Samnium, to which *Dr. Mosheim* refers. See his works, Epist. 130, or in some editions Ep. 80. It is cited also in *Baronius*, Annales, Ann. 459, sub. finem. The following is a literal translation. "We also decide, that it is every way proper to rescind the practice, so contrary to the apostolic rule, which

I learn, has been lately followed by some. Let not written statements concerning the nature of the particular sins, be any longer rehearsed in public; since it is sufficient to disclose the accusations of the conscience to the priests, by a private confession. For although that abundance of faith may seem commendable, which, from reverence of God, does not hesitate to take shame before men; yet as the sins of all, are not of such a nature that the penitents have no fear to publish them; let this censurable practice be abolished; lest many should be kept back from doing penance, because they are either ashamed or afraid to disclose their deeds before their enemies, by whom they may be troubled with processes of law. For that confession is sufficient, which is made, first to God, and then also to the priest, whose business it is to pray over the sins of the penitents. For then, more persons can be induced to do penance, if the [private] *consciousness* of the confessing person is not published in the ears of the people."—See also *Bower's Lives of the Popes, Leo I*, vol. ii. p. 124 &c. ed. Lond. 1750 Tr.]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SCHISMS AND HERESIES.

§ 1, 2, 3. Old heresies remaining. The Donatists.—§ 4. State of the Arians.—§ 5. Origin of the Nestorian sect.—§ 6, 7. The occasion of it.—§ 8. The council of Ephesus.—§ 9. Opinion respecting this controversy.—§ 10. Progress of Nestorianism after this council.—§ 11, 12. Its propagator, Eusebius.—§ 13. Eutychian sect.—§ 14. The council called *Conventus Lulroaum*.—§ 15. Council of Chalcedon.—§ 16. Subsequent contests.—§ 17. In Syria and Armenia.—§ 18. Troubles occasioned by Peter the fuller. Theopaschites.—§ 19. The *Henoticon* of Zeno.—§ 20. produces new contests among the Eutychians.—§ 21. Among the defenders of the council of Chalcedon.—§ 22. The doctrines of Eutyches and the Monophysites.—§ 23. The Pelagian controversy.—§ 24. Its progress.—§ 25. The Praedestinarrians.—§ 26. The Semi-Pelagians.—§ 27. Various controversies concerning grace.

§ 1. Some of the sects of the preceding times, having acquired accessions to their strength, now disquieted the church. I will pass in silence those inauspicious names of former days, the *Novatians*, the *Marcionites*, and *Manichaeans*, notwithstanding a numerous progeny of them appeared here and there ; and will confine my remarks to those two pests of the preceding century, the *Donatists* and the *Arians*.

The *Donatists* had hitherto enjoyed prosperity. But near the commencement of this century, the catholic bishops of Africa, led on principally by St. *Augustine* of Hippo, put forth all their energies to crush and destroy this sect ; which was not only very troublesome to the church, but through the *Circumcelliones* who were its soldiers, pernicious also to the commonwealth. Accordingly, in the year 404, the council of Carthage sent deputies to the emperor *Honorius*, petitioning that the imperial laws against heretics might be extended to embrace explicitly the *Donatists*, who denied that they were *heretics* ; and also, that the fury of the *Circumcelliones* might be restrained.(1) The emperor therefore, first imposed a fine upon all *Donatists*, who should refuse to return to the church, and ordered their bishops and teachers to be banished.(2) The following year, additional and more se-

(1) [The documents of this transaction, may be found in *Mansi*, Collectio Concilior. ampliss. Tom. iii. p. 1157, and in *Harduin's* Collection, Tom. i. in Cod. eccles. African. Can. 92 &c. p. 915 &c. and in *du Pin*, Monument. vet. ad Donatist. histor. pertinent. p. 216. Compare also *Augustine*, Ep. 93. and, among the moderns, Dr. *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iv. p. 192 &c. *Schl.*]

(2) [Even before the arrival of the deputies from the council, the emperor had determined vigorously to persecute the *Donatists*, and to compel them to a union with their opposers ; and had issued a law, by which the refractory bishops and clergy were to be banished, and the laity to be fined. The character of this law may be learned from *Augustine*, Epist. 185, § 25 &c. and Epist. 88, § 7. The

vere laws were enacted against the Donatists; which were usually called (*edicta unitatis*) *Acts of Uniformity*.(3) And as the magistrates were perhaps somewhat remiss in executing these laws, the council of Carthage in the year 407, sent a new deputation to the emperor, by which they requested and obtained the appointment of special executors of these Acts of Uniformity.(4)

§ 2. The weakened party recovered some strength and courage, in the year 408, when *Stilicho* was put to death by order of *Honorius*;(5) and still more, in the year 409, when *Honorius* issued a law that no one should be compelled in matters of religion.(6) But the council of Carthage, in the year 410, again sent a deputation to the emperor, and obtained a repeal of this law;(7) and likewise the appointment of *Marcellinus*, a tribune, and a notary [or imperial secretary,] to visit Africa, in the year 411, with full power to bring this long and pernicious controversy to a conclusion. Accordingly, *Marcellinus*, about the feast of Easter AD. 411, in that solemn trial which is called a *conference*, formally examined the cause, and after a three days hearing of the parties, gave sentence in favor of the *catholics*.(8) Before this court, 286 catholic bishops, and 279 Donatist bishops, were assembled. The Donatists, on being vanquished, appealed indeed to the emperor; but it was in vain. The principal actor in all these scenes was the celebrated *Augustine*; who by his writings, his counsels, and his admonitions, controled nearly the

law itself is probably lost. The edict which was issued after the petition of the council, is in the Codex Theodos. de haeret. L. 38. *Schl.*]

(3) [These *Edicts of Uniformity* are mentioned in the Codex Theodos. L. 2. de religione; and in the Decree of the council of Carthage AD. 407, in Cod. eccles. African. Can. 99, and by *du Pin*, p. 220. *Godofroi* and *Tillemont* suppose the before mentioned law, (L. 38. de haeret.) and (L. 3. ne Bapt. iterand.) were included among them. *Schl.*]

(4) [The documents are found in *du Pin*; and the laws, in the Codex Theodos. L. 41 and 43, de haeret. *Schl.*]

(5) [See *Augustine*, Ep. 97. § 2 &c. Ep. 100. § 2. Ep. 105. § 6. *Schl.*]

(6) [This law, is in the Codex Theodos. L. 50. de haeret. and in *du Pin*, Monument. p. 224. *Schl.*]

(7) [See *Noris*, Historia Donatistor. p. 533. *Schl.*]

(8) See *Fran. Balduin*, (who was a lawyer,) Historia Collationis Carthag. subjoined to *Optatus Milevitanus*, ed. *du Pin*, p. 337.—This meeting, called by *Marcellinus*, is improperly denominated a *conference*, or a free discussion; for the Donatists and catholics did not enter into a disputation, in which each party endeavored to vanquish the other by arguments. It was truly and properly a *legal trial*; in which *Marcellinus*, as the judge of this ecclesiastical cause appointed by the emperor, after a three days hearing of the parties, pronounced sentence authoritatively. It appears therefore, that no one then, once thought of any *supreme judge* in the church, appointed by *Christ*. These bishops of Africa made application solely to the emperor, in this contest.—[For an account of this *Conference*, the reader may consult with advantage Dr. *Walch's* Historie der Ketzeren, vol. iv. p. 198 &c. As to the sources of knowledge concerning it, see the Gesta Collationis Carthagine habitae, published in *du Pin's* Monument. vet. ad hist. Donatist. p. 225 &c. and in *Harduin's* Collectio Concil. Tom. i. p. 1043 &c. also *Augustine*, Brevicul. Collationis cum Donatistis, in his Opp. Tom. ix. p. 371 &c. *Schl.*]

whole African church, as well as the leading men of the country.(9)

§ 3. By the Conference at Carthage, the Donatist party lost a large part of its strength; nor could it ever recover from the shock, although the revolutions of the country were favorable to it. Very many, through fear of punishment, submitted to the will of the emperor, and returned to the church. On the contumacious, the severest penalties were inflicted, such as fines, banishment, confiscation of goods, and even death upon the more obstinate and seditious.(10) Some escaped these penalties by flight, others by concealing themselves, and some by a voluntary death; for the Donatists were much inclined to practice self-immolation. The *Circumcelliones* escaped, by travelling up and down the province, with arms and violence, every where venting their rage. Their former liberties and repose were indeed restored to the Donatists, by the Vandals, who under *Genseric* their king, invaded Africa in the year 427, and wrested this province from the Romans. But the edicts of the emperors had inflicted such a wound on the sect, that though it revived and grew a little under the Vandals, it could never recover the amplitude and strength it formerly possessed.(11)

§ 4. The Arians, oppressed and persecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among those barbarous nations who gradually overturned the Roman empire in the West, and found among the Goths, Heruli, Suevi, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed residence and a quiet retreat. Being now safe, they treated the catholics with the same violence, which the catholics had employed against them and other heretics, and had no hesitation about persecuting the adherents to the Nicene doctrines in a variety of ways. The Vandals, who had established their kingdom

(9) [His writings against the Donatists, fill the whole *ninth* volume of his works; according to the Amsterdam impression of the Benedictine edition. His recommendations, in the Donatist contest, were not always the best. In his *Epistles to Vincentius* and to *Boniface*, he speaks in such a manner about punishing heretics, that he must be regarded as the man whose writings afforded most support to that spirit of persecution, which laid waste the church in after ages, more than in his own times. In the contest with the Donatists, he seemed often to show himself on the side of those who would pursue mild measures; for he himself made representations to the imperial court against punishing the Donatists with death. Yet these representations are founded, not on correct views respecting toleration, but on the current principle that it is unseemly for christians to bear a part in the execution of criminals. *Schl.*]

(10) [By virtue of the law, (Codex Theodos. de haereticis L. 52.) all Donatists without distinction, and their married women, if they would not unite with the orthodox, were to be fined, according to the wealth of each individual. Such as would not be reclaimed by this means, were to forfeit all their goods; and such as protected them, were liable to the same penalties. Servants and country tenants, were to undergo corporeal punishments by their masters and lords, or on the other hand suffer the same pecuniary mulcts. The bishops and all the clergy were to be banished to different places, yet always beyond the province; and all Donatist churches were transferred to the opposite party. *Schl.*]

(11) [See *Witsius*, *Histor. Donatist.* c. viii. § 9. *Schl.*]

in Africa, surpassed all the rest in cruelty and injustice. At first *Genseric* their king, and then *Huneric* his son, demolished the temples of such christians as maintained the divinity of the Savior, sent their bishops into exile, mutilated many of the more firm and decided, and tortured them in various ways.(12) And they expressly stated, that they were authorized to do so, by the example of the emperors, who had enacted similar laws against the Donatists in Africa, the Arians, and others who dissented from them in religion.(13) During this African persecution, God himself is said to have confuted the Arians by a great miracle, causing by his almighty power the persons, whose tongues had been cut out by order of the tyrants, to speak distinctly notwithstanding, and to proclaim the glory and the praises of *Christ*. The fact itself, no one can well deny, for it rests on powerful testimony: but whether there was any thing supernatural in it, may be questioned.(14)

(12) See *Victor Vitensis*, de Persecutione Vandalica Libri iii; published by *Theod. Ruinart*, in connexion with his own *Historia Persecutionis Vandal.* Paris, 1698. 8vo. [and reprinted, Venice, 1732.]

(13) See the edict of king *Huneric*, in *Victor Vitensis*, Lib. iv. c. ii. p. 64. where much is said on this subject.

(14) See *Ruinart*, *Historia Persecut. Vandal.* Pt. ii. c. 7. p. 422 &c. and the recent and acute discussions of some Englishmen, respecting this miracle. *Bibliothèque Britannique*, Tome iii. Pt. ii. p. 339 &c. Tom. v. Pt. i. p. 171 &c. [Dr. *Maclaine* has here a long note, in review of the discussions respecting this alleged miracle, by *Abadie*, *Beriman*, *Chapman*, and *Dodwell*, who defend the miracle; and by an anonymous writer, and *Middleton*, and *Toll*, who controvert it. The discussion turned on four points, (1) the credibility of the testimony; (2) the degree in which the men were mutilated; (3) the possibility of speaking with imperfect, and even with no tongues; and (4) the probability that God would work a miracle to decide such a theological dispute.—*Schlegel's* note is more historical, and though long, may be worth inserting entire. *Huneric* (he says) in the beginning of his reign, was very indulgent to the orthodox. and at the request of the emperor *Zeno*, allowed them to choose a bishop of Carthage, on condition that the Arian churches in the Roman empire should be allowed the same privilege. The orthodox did actually choose *Eugenius* for their bishop. (*Victor Vitensis*, de Persecut. Vandal. Lib. ii. cap. 7.) But by the instigation of the Arian bishops, *Huneric* afterwards changed his course. He forbid any person, in a Vandal dress, attending the orthodox worship; and dismissed such of them as were in his service, and condemned them to labor in the fields. In the year 483, he banished to the deserts a great number of their teachers, with their adherents, on pretence of a violation of the royal statutes. In the year 484, in February, a formal conference of both parties was appointed; when the orthodox handed in a long confession of their faith; but without gaining a hearing from the Vandal patriarch, *Cyrila*. After this, *Huneric* forbid by a severe law all public worship among the orthodox: ordered their books to be burned; caused the 466 bishops, who had been called to Carthage, to be arrested and banished to different countries; and endeavored to compel all his subjects to become Arians. Many confessors then endured the most distressing sufferings, and a great number of them were cruelly put to death. At Typasus in Mauritania, most of the inhabitants fled to Spain, because *Cyrila* determined to force upon them an Arian bishop. Such as staid behind refused to accept the bishop, and kept up their own separate worship. *Huneric* therefore caused their tongues to be cut out by the roots, and their right hands to be chopped off. They were able, notwithstanding, to speak distinctly. *Victor* expresses himself with so much assurance on this subject, that he says, whoever doubts the fact, need only go to Constantinople, where he will now meet with a sub-deacon, named *Reparatus*, who, although his tongue

§ 5. A new sect, which was the source of lamentable evils to the church, was formed by *Nestorius*, a Syrian by birth, bishop of Constantinople, a pupil of the celebrated *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, a man of eloquence, and not without learning, but arrogant and indiscreet. That *Christ* was truly God, and at the same time truly man, had been placed beyond all controversy, by the decrees of former councils: but as to the *mode* and the *effects* of the union of these two natures in *Christ*, hitherto there had been no discussion among christians, and nothing had been decided by the councils. The christian doctors were therefore accustomed to express themselves differently respecting this mystery. Some used expressions, which seemed to separate between the Son of God and the Son of man, too far, and to make out *two persons* in *Christ*. Others seemed to confound the Son of God with the Son of man, and to make both natures in *Christ* coalesce, and constitute but *one person*. The Syrian and oriental doctors differed, in this matter, from those of Alexandria and Egypt, after the rise of the sect of *Apollinaris*; for he taught that the man *Christ* was without a proper human soul, and that the divine nature in *Christ* supplied the place of a rational soul; whence it followed that two natures were mixed and confounded [in the complex character of *Christ*.] The Syrians, therefore, to distinguish themselves from the followers of *Apollinaris*, carefully distinguished the *man* from the *God* in *Christ*, and used phraseology which might lead to the supposition, that they divided the person of *Christ* into *two persons*. On the contrary, the Alexandrians and the Egyptians were accustomed to adopt modes of ex-

was cut out, nevertheless speaks without any effort, clearly, and distinctly, and is on that account in high esteem in the court of the emperor Zeno, and especially with the empress. *Aeneas* of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher, who then lived at Constantinople, and was an eye-witness, (in his Dialogue on the Resurrection, entitled *Theophrastus*, p. 81.) says he had himself seen these people, and had heard them, to his amazement, speak distinctly; that he would not trust his ears, but ascertained the fact by ocular proof; that he made them open their mouths, and then found that their tongues were cut out at the roots. *Procopius* testifies, that many of those whose tongues had been cut out, were living at Constantinople in his times, and that they spoke very distinctly. The count *Marcellinus*, who was chancellor to *Justinian*, and compiled his Chronicle from the records of the judicial courts, says: *se vidisse mutum quendam, ita natum, post abscissam linguam statim locutum, refutasse Arianorum haeresin et de fide christiana veras voces emisisse.* *Isidorus*, in his Chronicle, testifies also to the fact; as does *Evagrius*, in his Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. c. 4. See *Valesius* on these passages; and *Sagittarius*, de Cruciat. Martyr. p. 296. and *Joh. And. Schmidt*, Diss. de elinguat. mysterium Trinitatis praedicantibus; in his Decas Dissertt. hist. theol. No. 7. Even *Justinian* himself, (Codex Justin. Lib. i. Tit. 27, de officio praefecti praetorio Africae,) says: "We have seen venerable men, with their tongues cut out from the roots, lamentably describing their sufferings." One must therefore carry historical scepticism quite too far, if he would question the reality of the fact. But whether it be not possible, that a man should speak distinctly without a tongue, and also whether that, which took place in Africa during this persecution, was a real miracle, or not, are more properly physical than historical questions. Tr.]

pression, which might be charged with favoring Apollinarism, and which seemed to imply a confusion of the two natures. *Nestorius*, being bred in the Syrian schools, and extremely anxious for the extermination of all the sects, and especially that of the Apollinarists, discoursed of the two natures in *Christ*, after the manner of his instructors, and directed his hearers to make a distinction between the Son of God and the Son of man, and carefully to discriminate the actions and sensations of the one from those of the other.(15)

§ 6. The occasion for this controversy, was given by *Anastasius*, a presbyter and the intimate friend of *Nestorius*. This presbyter, in a public discourse delivered AD. 428, opposed the use of the word θεοτόκος, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently applied to the mother of *Christ*, in discussions with the Arians, than formerly; and to which the Apollinarists were exceedingly attached: alleging that the holy virgin could only be called χριστοτόκος, *mother of Christ*; because *God* could neither be born, nor die, and that only the *Son of man* was born of *Mary*. *Nestorius* approved this discourse of his friend; and in several addresses, explained and defended it.(16) Some monks at Constantinople made opposition, maintaining that the son of *Mary* was *God incarnate*; and they endeavored to stir up the people against *Nestorius*. But most persons were pleased with his discourses; and when they were carried to the monks of Egypt, these were so moved by his arguments, that they embraced his opinions, and ceased to denominate *Mary* the *mother of God*.(17)

§ 7. *Cyril*, a man of a most restless and arrogant spirit, was

(15) *A History of Nestorianism*, was written in French, by the Jesuit, *Ludov. Doucin*, Paris 1716, 4to. But it is such a one as might be expected from a person, who was obliged to rank *Cyril* among the saints, and *Nestorius* among the heretics. [A better account is given by *C. W. F. Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. v. p. 289 &c. to the end of the volume.] The ancient writers, on both sides, are mentioned by *J. F. Buddeus*, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1084 &c. In what manner the oriental writers relate the matter, is stated by *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 108, and by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Bibliotheca Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. iii. P. II. p. lxxvii &c. [For the sources of knowledge, and a list of the writers, on this controversy, see *Walch*, loc. cit. p. 304 &c.—For testimony to the persecuting spirit of *Nestorius*, see *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles. L. vii. c. 29*, where we are told, that on the very day of his installation, he thus publicly addressed the emperor: "Give me a country purged of heretics, and I will recompense you with heaven; aid me to conquer the heretics, and I will aid you to conquer the Persians." And five days after, he commenced his work, by demolishing the *Arian* house of worship, and proceeded to persecute the *Novatians*, the *Quartodecimani*, and the *Macedonians*. He was undoubtedly a rash zealot; yet a person of some talents, sincere, and by no means inclined to be a heresiarch. See a general account of him, in note (31) pa. 395, above. Tr.]

(16) See these discourses of *Nestorius*, in the works of *Marius Mercator*, tom. ii. p. 5 &c. accompanied with the observations of *Joh. Garnier*: [See also *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccl. L. vii. c. 32.* Tr.]

(17) [*Cyril*, against *Nestorius*, Lib. i. and in his *Epistle to the monks*, to *Nestorius*, and to *Coelestine.* Schl.]

then bishop of Alexandria; and of course jealous of the increasing power and authority of the Constantinopolitan prelate. On hearing of this controversy, he at once blamed both his monks and *Nestorius*. But as the latter would not retract, *Cyril*, after advising with *Caelestine* the bishop of Rome, resolved on war: and calling a council at Alexandria AD. 430, he hurled twelve *anathemas* at the head of *Nestorius*: who, finding himself accused of blasphemy against *Christ*, returned as many *anathemas* against *Cyril*; accusing him of the same crime, and of Apollinarianism, and of confounding the two natures of *Christ*.⁽¹⁸⁾ This contest between two bishops of the highest order, which originated rather from the depraved passions of the mind than from a sincere love of truth, was the parent and the cause of immense evils.

(18) See *Joh. Harduin*, *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 2199. Other *anathemas*, different from the published ones, are set forth by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatiean.* tom. iii. P. II. p. 199 &c.—[A more circumstantial account of the events touched on in this section, drawn from *Dr. Walch*, is contained in the following note of *von Einem*. The Epistle of *Cyril* to the Egyptian monks, was brought to Constantinople: and it justly gave offence to *Nestorius*, and his friends; for *Cyril* might at least have sought a friendly correspondence with *Nestorius*. The epistle was refuted by *Nestorius*. *Cyril* then wrote to *Nestorius*; who answered him shortly, and gave him to understand, that he had as little inclination for a controversy, as to have *Cyril* for a judge in this matter. *Dorotheus* bishop of Marcianople, was so indiscreet as to anathematize publicly in the church, the doctrine that *Mary* was the *mother of God*; and this inflamed *Cyril* the more, as he supposed the opposite party meant to anathematize him. In the mean time, *Cyril* was accused by some Alexandrians at Constantinople, of various offences, the nature and grounds of which are not known. *Cyril* therefore became suspicious of *Nestorius*; and his conduct towards him was offensive. Both prelates now wrote to each other, using severe language. *Cyril* also sent prolix statements to the emperor, and to the princesses *Pulcheria*, *Arcadia*, and *Marinia*: which thing however was not relished by the emperor, who supposed *Cyril* aimed to produce disagreement in the emperor's family. The contest now reached *Coelestine*, bishop of Rome. *Nestorius* wrote to him first; and although on another matter, yet he gave him a full account of the disturbances at Constantinople, but without even mentioning *Cyril*. He also sent his discourses. But as *Coelestine* did not understand Greek, (a poor commendation of a bishop of Rome!) the discourses were laid by, unread, and the letter was not answered. *Nestorius* repeated his letters, but without mentioning *Cyril*, or attempting to prejudice *Coelestine* against him. *Cyril* however, fearing such a thing, sent *Possidonius* to Rome, with the writings of *Nestorius*, and his correspondence with him, translated into Latin; and invited *Coelestine* to join him against *Nestorius*. *Coelestine* acknowledges, that his first acquaintance with the heresy of *Nestorius*, was derived from the statement of *Cyril*. He held a council at Rome, and made a decree, that *Nestorius* should be deposed, unless he recanted within ten days after receiving his letter. Besides the letters to *Nestorius* and to *Cyril*, (to the latter of whom he committed the execution of his decree,) he sent a letter to the clergy and people of Constantinople, and a circular letter to the other patriarchs and bishops. *Cyril* forwarded the circular, accompanying it with additional letters; but the letter to the chief men of Constantinople, he kept back. *John*, bishop of Antioch, sent the letter he received from *Cyril* to *Nestorius*; and accompanied it with such observations as were an honor to him, and which made such an impression on *Nestorius*, that he explained himself well in public discourses, and merely rejected the *erroneous meaning* of the phrase, *mother of God*. Whether *Cyril* was made acquainted with the change in the circumstances of the case, is not known. He now called a council at Alexandria, in which a letter was drawn up addressed to *Nestorius*, and also twelve condemnatory propositions for him to subscribe, as the formula of his retractation. A letter was also directed to the officers and mem-

§ 8. The feelings of the parties being so exasperated by their reciprocal excommunications and letters, that there was no prospect of an amicable termination of the controversy, the emperor, *Theodosius II.* assembled a council at Ephesus, in the year 431, which is accounted the *third general council*. *Cyril*, the adversary of *Nestorius*, presided; and he wished to have the cause examined and decided, before *John*, the bishop of Antioch, and the other bishops of the East, should arrive. *Nestorius* maintained, that both circumstances were contrary to equity; and therefore when summoned to trial, he refused to appear. But *Cyril* pressing the business forward, without a hearing of the cause, and a great part of the bishops being absent, *Nestorius*, whom the council compare with *Judas* the betrayer of the Savior, was condemned as guilty of blasphemy, deprived of his office, and sent into banishment; where he closed his days.(19)

bers of the church at Constantinople, exhorting them to rise against their patriarch. A third letter was addressed to the monks. Four bishops were appointed to deliver to *Nestorius* the letter of the council, and also the still retained letter of *Coelstine* to him. He did not speak with these delegated bishops, nor comply with the demands of the letters; but his public discourses became more embittered. The retaliatory anathemas, which he now published, were undoubtedly designed to bring *Cyril* under suspicion, as holding erroneous opinions concerning the person of *Christ*. *John* of Antioch, and many oriental bishops with him, actually judged the propositions of *Cyril* to be erroneous. *Nestorius*, on the contrary, was declared by *John*, to have explained himself in an orthodox manner. In the mean time *Nestorius* was proceeding with zeal, and excommunicated many persons.—See *Dr. Walch's Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 700 &c. *von Ein.*]

(19) Concerning this council, the principal work to be consulted is the *Variarum Patrum Epistolae ad concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*, which *Chr. Lupus* published, from some MSS. at Cassino and in the Vatican, *Louvain* 1682. 4to. *Nestorius* was transported to Petra in Arabia, then to Oasis, a desert place in Egypt, where he probably died in the year 435, [or rather, after AD. 439.] The accounts of his lamentable death, given by *Exagrius*, *Hist. Eccles. Li. i. c. 7.* and by *Theodorus Lector*, *Hist. Eccles. L. ii. p. 565*, are undoubtedly fables deserving no credit.—[On the council of Ephesus, see *Dr. Walch, Historie der Kirchenversamml. p. 275 &c.* and *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 452 &c; from which the following account is taken.—The emperor called the council; *Nestorius* was one of the first that arrived. With him, came two imperial ministers of state, one of whom was accompanied by soldiers, to protect the council, and was commanded by the emperor to remain with the council. *Cyril* of Alexandria appeared also, attended by a number of Egyptian bishops, who, with *Memnon*, bishop of Ephesus, were of his party. From the western provinces appeared only three deputies from the see of Rome, and one deacon deputed by the bishop of Carthage. *Cyril* presided, though a party. *Nestorius* with the imperial commissioners, made the reasonable request that the opening of the council might be deferred, till the arrival of *John* of Antioch and the other eastern bishops, and also of the Italian and Sicilian members. But neither prayers, nor tears, nor commands in the name of the emperor, could move the fiery *Cyril* to delay; although it was affirmed that *John* and the other eastern bishops were within five days travel of Ephesus. The council was opened June 22. The imperial commissioner gave his public protest against the proceeding, and then retired. *Nestorius* was cited three times to appear; but he refused to stand before a court thus illegally sitting, and from which he had so little reason to expect justice. He was therefore, on the same day, pronounced a heretic, by an irregular outcry. The condemnation was not founded on the holy scriptures, but on the writings of the fathers. The next day, the decision was communicated to

That base artifices and dispositions were very operative in this council, and that *Cyril* was influenced more by his passions than by justice and piety, no wise and good man will readily deny; but the doctrine established by the council, that *Christ* consists of *one divine person*, yet of *two natures* most closely *united*, but *not mixed and confounded*, has been approved and acknowledged by the great body of christians.

§ 9. To pass by the minor errors which were attributed to *Nestorius*, he is said to have divided *Christ* into two persons; and to have held, that the divine nature joined itself to the full formed man, and only aided him during his life. But *Nestorius*

Nestorius; and an account of it was sent to Constantinople, with a letter recommending the immediate choice of a new bishop. *Candidianus*, the imperial commissioner, and *Nestorius* transmitted an account of the whole procedure to the emperor; and the former endeavored, though in vain, to arrest the irregular proceedings at Ephesus. The arrival of John and the eastern bishops, on the 27th of June, made the state of things worse, rather than better. They were offended with the council, for not waiting for their arrival; and united themselves with a considerable part of the council, who opposed the violent measures against *Nestorius*, and who accused *Cyril* of many errors. Whether the two parties had afterwards any communication with each other is uncertain. *John* presided over the dissenting party, who met in the house where he lodged; and who in their precipitancy declared *Cyril* and *Memnon* to be deposed, and to be banished. From this time, there were two councils sitting at Ephesus, the one under *Cyril*, and the other under *John*, as the presidents. The latter was supported by the imperial commissioner. But both committed such extravagances, as shew that the spirit of meekness did not rest upon these fathers. These intemperate proceedings threatened to kindle a flame in the church, and even to disturb the public peace. The emperor therefore thought it necessary to bring the matter before his court, and to proceed rather upon principles of good policy than of strict justice. He confirmed the decisions of both parties against each other, in regard to *Nestorius*, *Cyril* and *Memnon*; and sent another of his ministers to Ephesus, to expel these three bishops from the city, and to admonish the others to unite and act together. In the mean time the bishops of *Cyril's* party had held no less than six sessions; in the three first of which, the arrival and formal accession of the delegates from Rome, to all the proceedings of *Cyril* against *Nestorius*, and the making out of an account of this, to be sent to the emperor, were the principal transactions. The three subsequent sessions tended farther to widen the breach, as the eastern bishops were publicly excommunicated by the party of *Cyril*, and a new confession of faith was framed by them. The imperial minister now arrived, and put *Cyril* and *Memnon* under arrest; but he labored in vain to unite the fiercely contending parties. Both concluded to send their respective deputies to the court, which was then at Chalcedon. Historians tell us, the court people were friendly to *Nestorius*. If so, it will be difficult to assign the cause of the unexpected revocation by the emperor of his former decree, which deprived *Cyril* and *Memnon* of their offices, while he still condemned *Nestorius* to banishment. The party of *Cyril*, indeed, when they found things not proceeding according to their wishes at Ephesus, made every effort to meet the investigation of the case before the imperial court. And their movements were not unsuccessful. The outcry of the more worthless clergy and the monks against *Nestorius*, may have made considerable impression, producing fear of an insurrection, if *Cyril* were punished. Besides, *Nestorius* fell under the displeasure of *Pulcheria*, the emperor's sister, who had vast influence over him. And *Cyril* cooperated by means,—always very efficacious in courts,—the bribery of the ministers. It is strange, that the subsequent ages should have regarded the Ephesine assembly as ranking among councils of the highest order; since in regard to the principal points, it decided nothing happily, and what was done, was in reality done by the emperor.—*Schlegel's* abridgment of *Walch*, corrected by the original. Tr.]

himself, as long as he lived, professed himself utterly opposed to such sentiments, (20) Nor were such sentiments ever directly stated by him, but only inferred by his adversaries, from his rejection of the epithet *mother of God*, and from some incautious and ambiguous terms which he used. Hence, very many both among the ancients and the moderns think, that he held the same sentiments that the Ephesine fathers did, though he expressed himself in a different manner; and they cast the whole blame of this most destructive contest upon the restless spirit of *Cyril*, and his malignant disposition towards *Nestorius*. (21) Allowing these

(20) See *Marius Mercator*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 286, ed. *Garnier*: and *Fragments of the Epistles of Nestorius*, written a little before his death; in *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 40, 41.

(21) Among the moderns, *Luther* first held such sentiments, and inveighed bitterly against *Cyril*: de Conciliis, in his Opp. tom. vii. ed. Altenb. p. 265, 266, 273 &c. He was followed by innumerable others; as *Peter Bayle*, *Dictionaire*, tom. iii. [and iv,] artic. *Nestorius* and *Rodon*. *Christ. Aug. Salig*, de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem, p. 200: *Otto Fred. Schütz*, de Vita Chytraei Lib. ii. § 29. p. 190, 191: *Jo. Voigt*, *Biblioth. Historiae Haeresial.* tom. i. P. II. p. 457: *Paul. Fran. Jablonsky*, *Exercit. de Nestorianismo*, Berl. 1720, 8vo: *Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus*, tom. i. p. 184 &c. tom. iii. p. 175: *Jordan*, *Vie de Mr. la Croze*, p. 231, and many others. What may be alleged against *Nestorius*, is carefully collected by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. P. II. p. 210 &c. [*C. W. F. Walch*, (*Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 778 &c.) after a careful investigation, states the sentiments of *Nestorius* in the following propositions. (1) The doctrine of three persons in the one divine essence, as stated in the Nicene Creed, is true and certain. (2) In particular, the second Person, the divine *Word*, is true God, eternally begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with him. (3) Yet *Christ* is not only true God, but likewise a complete man; that is, he had a body and a rational soul, just as we have. (4) His body he derived from the virgin *Mary*, and in her womb. (5) Nothing therefore is more certain, than that *Christ* possessed *two natures*, a divine and a human. (6) Yet there are not, on this account, *two persons*, two Sons, two Christs, two Lords; but he is *one person*, one Christ, one Son, one Lord. (7) There was therefore a union between the perfect God, the *Word*, and the perfect man; and this union may be expressed by various terms, among which *συνάφεια* [*connexion*] is the best, but *ἑνωσις* [*union*] is not to be rejected. (8) To the question, *What was united?* *Nestorius* answered: *God and man*, the divinity and humanity, the *two natures*, or two *substances* and *hypostasies*; but not two *persons*. (9) This union did not consist in this, that the natures ceased to possess their peculiar properties; for the essential difference of the two natures remained, without the least change or commixtion. (10) Yet the union was inseparable, so that the *Word* was never afterwards without the assumed man, nor the man without the *Word*. (11) The union of the two natures *commenced* with the existence of the human nature, when he was conceived in the womb of his mother. (12) It is therefore correctly said, the *Word* became man, and was made flesh. (13) It is also correctly said, the Son of God took upon him man. (14) It is easy to state, what kind of union *Nestorius* did *not* admit; but it cannot be proved, that he distinctly believed, as bishop *John* states. (15) To explain the connexion of the two natures of *Christ*, as united in one person, *Nestorius* said: The Son of God *dwells* in the man; and the flesh is the *temple* of God. Yet he explained himself, by saying, that he did not understand *such an indwelling*, as the indwelling of God in the faithful and in the prophets. (16) *Nestorius* called the human nature *an instrument*, by which the Son of God worked; and *a garment*, with which he was clad; and said, God *carried* and *bare* the man. (17) He also admitted a *communion* or *intercourse* of the two natures. (18) And at the same time, held to the so called *personal properties*. (19) In respect to the *communication* of attributes, *Nestorius* held that, in the scriptures, names are used in reference to our

to judge correctly, still *Nestorius* must be pronounced guilty of two faults : first, that he was disposed, rashly, and with offence to many, to abolish the use of a harmless term, (22) which had been

Savior, which indicate the *union of the two* natures, but not one nature as *distinct* from the other ; names, with which we must connect the idea of the *entire Christ* ; e. g. *Immanuel, Christ, Jesus, Son, Only Begotten, Lord*. (20) *Nestorius* admitted that the scriptures attribute to *Christ* both divine and human attributes and acts. And he states this rule for interpreting them : Every attribute and act, which the scriptures ascribe to *Christ*, must be understood indeed of the *one person*, yet not of *both his natures* ; but the sublime and God-befitting, must be referred to the *divine* nature, and the inferior, to the *human* nature. (21) In the writings of *Nestorius*, noticeable passages occur, relating to expressions which denote the *participation or communication* of attributes, and which are indicative of his real sentiments on the subject. They may be divided into two classes. To the first class, belong the expressions, by which the properties and changes of the *human* nature are referred to *Christ* in his *divine* nature, or, (according to the customary phraseology of those times,) to the *Word* that was God. The first expression is that of *being born*. It is undeniable, that *Nestorius*, (though not likewise his friends, a few only excepted,) rejected the use of the term *mother of God* ; as also the expression, *Mary bore the Deity*, or, *what was born of Mary, was God*. Yet it is equally undeniable, that *Nestorius* did not reject the term *mother of God*, nor indeed the other expressions, utterly and perseveringly, except under the limitation, *being so and so understood* ; otherwise he acknowledged and professed the correctness and harmlessness of them. (22) The next expression is, *the sufferings, the death and burial* of *Christ*. *Nestorius* did not deny, that it was *God*, or *man in union with God*, i. e. *one Christ*, that was crucified, suffered, died, and was buried. But he did deny, that *Christ*, in so far as he was *God*, was the subject of these changes ; because he was, in his *divine* nature, unchangeable, and incapable of suffering and dying. (23) The third expression is *resurrection*. On this, his views were the same as on the preceding. As he had borrowed the word *temple* from John ii. 19 &c. he insisted, that *Christ* there distinguishes the temple, from him who raises it up. Yet this distinction he would understand to imply, not a division of *persons*, but only a difference of *natures*. (24) To the second class belong such as relate to the doctrine of a communication of the properties of the *divine* nature to the *human*. And here *Nestorius* did not deny, that the *man Christ*, possessed *divine* properties ; but only that he possessed them *of himself*, and not by virtue of the union. (25) He conceded, that to *Christ* as to his *human* nature, the *divine* names and titles were pertinent ; but with the limitation, again, *not of himself*, but *on account of the union*. (26) He admitted, that to the *man Christ*, *divine* worship belonged ; but, again, *not for his own sake*, but on account of the union. (27) The species of communication of attributes, which our theologians call *apotelesmatic*, (attributing the *mediatorial acts* of the redeemer in his *official capacity*, either to the complex person, or to either of his natures indiscriminately,) *Nestorius* fully recognized : and it is not true, that he regarded the work of *redemption*, as the work solely of the *human* nature. (28) Hence it follows, that *Nestorius* understood well, and expressed distinctly, the *unity of the person* of *Christ*, and also the *diversity and union* of the *two natures*, with its consequences ; yet that he was always anxious for excluding the use of such expressions, as obscured and rendered undiscernable the *distinction* of the two natures. Hence, when he spoke of *Christ*, he preferred using a name expressive of his complex person. Thus he would rather say *Χριστοτόκος mother of Christ*, than say *Θεοτόκος mother of God* ; or if the latter could not be avoided, he would add something to qualify it, as *mother of the God-Man*.—*Dr. Walch* is one who thinks the whole controversy between *Nestorius* and his accusers, was a mere dispute about words and phrases. But *Dr. Hofmann*, in a dispute at Wittemberg, AD. 1725, maintained, that *the Nestorian controversy was not mere logomachy*. Schl.]

(22) ["The title *mother of God*, applied to the virgin *Mary*, is not perhaps so innocent as *Dr. Mosheim* takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can present no idea at all, and to the ignorant and unwary it may present the most absurd and monstrous notions. The invention and use of such mysterious terms as have no place in scripture, are undoubtedly pernicious to true religion." Maccl.]

long current; and secondly, that he presumed to express and explain, by unsuitable phrases and comparisons, a mystery, which exceeds all human comprehension. If to these faults be added the excessive vanity and impetuosity of the man, it will be difficult to determine which was the principal cause of this great contest, *Cyrl*, or *Nestorius*.

§ 10. The council of Ephesus was so far from putting an end to these contentions, that it rather extinguished all hope of the restoration of harmony. *John*, bishop of Antioch, and the other eastern prelates, whose arrival *Cyrl* would not wait for, assembled at Ephesus; and they issued against *Cyrl*, and his friend *Memnon*, bishop of Ephesus, as severe a sentence, as *they* had issued against *Nestorius*. Hence arose a violent and troublesome controversy between *Cyrl* and those oriental bishops, who were under the guidance of *John* of Antioch. It was indeed partially adjusted in the year 433, when *Cyrl* acceded to a formula of faith prescribed by *John*, and rejected the use of certain suspicious phrases. Yet the commotions produced by this controversy, continued long in the East.(23) Thenceforward, no means could prevent the friends and disciples of *Nestorius* from spreading his doctrines through various provinces of the East, and every where gathering churches which rejected the Ephesine decrees.(24) The Persians, in particular, were averse from any reconciliation with *Cyrl*, and persevered in maintaining, that *Nestorius* was rashly condemned at Ephesus, and that *Cyrl* subverted the distinction between the two natures of *Christ*. The propagation of the Nestorian doctrines was still more successful, after the introduction of those doctrines into the celebrated Persian school which had for some time flourished at Edessa. For the teachers in this school, not only taught Nestorian principles to their pupils, but likewise translated from Greek into Syriac the writings of *Nestorius*, and his master, *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, as well as of *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and spread them throughout Assyria and Persia.(25)

§ 11. The Nestorian faith is indebted to no one of all its friends, more than it is to *Barsumas*; who was ejected from the school of Edessa, with his associates, and created, in the year 435, bishop of Nisibis. From the year 440 to the year 485, he

(23) See *Christ. Aug. Salig*, de Eutychnismo ante Eutychen, p. 243 &c. [and Dr. *Walch's* Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. v. p. 619 &c. *Schl.*]

(24) [The Roman provinces, in which Nestorianism most prevailed, were the two Syrias, the two Cilicias, Bithynia, Moesia, Thessaly, Isauria, and the second Cappadocia. *Tr.*]

(25) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. Tom. i. p. 351 &c. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. 69. From which with other passages, we should correct the account of the early history of Nestorianism, given by *Eus. Renaudot*, (Liturgiarum Oriental. Tom. ii. p. 99 &c.) and by others. See also *Theodorus Lector*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. p. 558.

labored with incredible assiduity and dexterity, to procure for Nestorianism a permanent establishment in Persia. *Maanes*, bishop of Ardaschir, was his principal coadjutor. His measures were so successful, that all the Nestorians in Chaldea, Persia, Assyria, and the neighboring countries, deservedly reverence this *Barsumas* alone, to this day, as their parent and founder. He persuaded the Persian monarch, *Pherozes*, to expel the christians who adhered to the opinions of the Greek fathers, and not only to admit Nestorians in their place, but to allow them to make the first cities in Persia, Seleucia, and Ctesiphon, their primary seat; which their *patriarch*, or *catholic*, occupies even down to our times. He also erected the famous school at *Nisibis*, from which issued those who, in this and the following century, carried the Nestorian doctrines into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and even to China.(26)

(26) All these transactions are well illustrated, by the before mentioned, *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. lxxvii &c. [The *Nestorians* are not called by this name in the East, (for they regard their doctrines as apostolic; and they never had any connexion with the person of *Nestorius*,) but are generally called *Chaldaic christians*, (because their principal or head church, is in the ancient Chaldea,) and in some part of the east Indies, *St. Thomas christians*, because they suppose they received christianity from the apostle *Thomas*.—They constitute a large christian community, which has no connexion with others, have their own forms of worship, their own bishops, and their own ecclesiastical councils. Their church extends through all Asia, and exists partly in the Persian, partly in the Turkish, and partly in the Mogul empires. The patriarch resides in a monastery not far from Mosul, and has a great many bishops under him. The enmity of the Persians, and afterwards of the Muhammedans and Saracens against the Romans, contributed much to further the spread of this sect; for they received all refugees from the Roman empire, and extended full protection to such christians as were not tolerated in the Roman provinces, and whom of course they could not suspect of any understanding with the Romans. *Ibas*, bishop of Edessa, was one of the greatest defenders of *Nestorius* among the orientals; and, on that account, his epistle to *Marin*, the Persian bishop of Ardaschir, was rejected by some councils. But the chief persons among them, were *Barsumas*, and his assistant *Maanes*. After the death of *Barsumas*, the archbishop of Seleucia, *Babacus*, became the head of the party; and from this time onward, the patriarchs (*catholici* or *jacelich*) resided at *Seleucia*, until, under the caliphs, *Bagdat* and *Mosul* were selected for that purpose. This *Babacus* held a council, in the year 499, in which not only the whole Persian church professed itself to belong to the Nestorian community, but regulations were also made, that all bishops and priests must be married, and second marriages of the clergy were not merely permitted but declared to be necessary. (See *Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. 177.) The *Nestorians* differ from other christians in the following particulars: that they will not call *Mary* the *mother of God*; and wholly reject the expressions, *God was crucified*, and *died*; that they admit no *natural and personal*, but only a *friendly, union* of the *Word, that was God*, (for so they speak,) with the *man Jesus*; that they teach, there are in *Christ* two natures and two substances, each of which has its own personality: that they reject the council of Ephesus; execrate *Cyril*, as being a wicked wretch; and venerate *Nestorius*, and *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, as being saints: that they worship no images; and perform their worship, which is very simple, in the Syriac language. Together with *baptism*, which they generally administer on the 40th day after the birth, and the *Lord's supper*, in which they use leavened bread; they make the *consecration of priests* to be a *sacrament*. They also practice anointing with oil, as a ceremony of worship; and likewise in slight diseases, and even in commencing journies, as a sort of consecration. See *Baumgarten's* Geschichte der Religionspartheyen, p. 586. Schl.]

§ 12. Before this sect became fully formed and established, there was some difference of opinion in it. Some said, that the manner in which the two natures in *Christ* were combined, was wholly unknown; but others denied any other connexion, than that of will, operation, and dignity.(27) But this disagreement wholly disappeared, from the time that the Nestorian community became duly consolidated. For it was decreed by the synods assembled at Seleucia, that there were in the Savior of mankind, *two persons* or ὑποστάσεις, namely a *divine*, that of the *Word*, and a *human* that of *Jesus*; yet that both persons constituted but one *Aspect*, or as they (following *Nestorius*) expressed it, one *Barsopa*, that is, πρὸς ὡπρόν: that this union of the Son of God with the Son of Man, took place at the moment of conception, and would never end: but that it was not a union of natures or persons, but only of will and affection: *Christ*, therefore, must be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in *Christ* as in his temple, (as *Nestorius* had said;) and that *Mary* should never be called the *mother of God*, but only the *mother of Christ*. They reverence *Nestorius*, as a holy man, and worthy of everlasting remembrance; but they maintain, that his doctrine was much more ancient than he, being derived from the earliest ages of the church; and therefore they wish not to be called *Nestorians*. And it appears, in fact, that *Barsumas* and his associates did not inculcate on their followers precisely the doctrines taught by *Nestorius*; but they in some measure polished his imperfect system, enlarged it, and connected with it other doctrines which *Nestorius* never embraced.

§ 13. Many, while careful to shun the fault of *Nestorius*, ran into the opposite extreme. The most noted of these was *Eutyches*, abbot of a certain convent of monks at Constantinople; from whom originated another sect, directly opposite to that of *Nestorius*, but equally troublesome and mischievous to the interests of christianity; and which, like that, spread with great rapidity throughout the East, and acquired such strength in its progress, that it gave immense trouble both to the Nestorians and to the Greeks, and became a great and powerful community. In the year 448, *Eutyches*, now far advanced in years, in order more effectually to put down *Nestorius* to whom he was a violent foe, explained the doctrine concerning the person of *Christ*, in the phraseology of the Egyptians; and maintained that there was *only one nature in Christ*, namely, that of the *Word*, who became *incarnate*.(28) Hence he was supposed to deny the *humanity*

(27) *Leontius* Byzantinus, adv. Nestorianos et Eutychianos; in *Hen. Canisii* Lectiones Antiquar. Tom. i. 537. and *Ja. Basnage*, Prolegom. ad Canisium, Tom. i. cap. ii. p. 19 &c.

(28) That *Cyril* had so expressed himself, and had appealed to the authority of *Athanasius*, to justify the phraseology, is beyond controversy. But whether

of Jesus Christ; and was accused, by *Eusebius* of Doryleum, before a council called by *Flavianus*, perhaps in this very year, at Constantinople. And as *Eutyches* refused to give up his opinions, at the bidding of this council, he was cast out of the church, and deprived of his office; and he, not acquiescing in this decree, appealed to a general council of the whole church. (29)

§ 14. The emperor *Theodosius* therefore, convoked at Ephesus, in the year 449, such a council as *Eutyches* had requested; and placed at the head of it *Dioscorus*, bishop of Alexandria, a man as ambitious and restless as *Cyril*, and hostile to the bishop of Constantinople. In this council, the business was conducted with the same kind of fairness and justice, as by *Cyril* in the council of Ephesus against *Nestorius*. For *Dioscorus*, in whose church nearly the same things were taught as *Eutyches* had advanced, so artfully managed and controlled the whole of the proceedings, that the doctrine of *one nature incarnate* was triumphant, and *Eutyches* was acquitted of all error. On the contrary,

Athanasius actually used such language, is doubtful; for many think the book in which it occurs, was not a production of *Athanasius*. See *Mich. le Quien*, Diss. ii. in Damascenum, p. xxxi &c. and *Christ. Aug. Salig*, de Eutychianismo ante Eutychem, p. 112 &c. That the Syrians used the same phraseology, before *Eutyches*' times, and without offence, is shewn by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. i. p. 219.—We are yet in want of a solid and accurate history of the *Eutychian* troubles; which however, *Christ. Aug. Salig* left in manuscript. [This has not yet been published: but *Dr. Ch. W. Fr. Walch*, has given a very elaborate and full history of the Eutychian and Monophysite sects, filling the whole vi, vii, and viii volumes of his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, Lips. 1773, 76—78, 8vo. and *M. Schroeckh* has treated the subject well, in his *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. xviii. p. 433—636, Lips. 1793. 8vo.—The points in controversy between *Eutyches* and his friends on the one part, and their antagonists on the other, during the first period of the contest, or till the council of Chalcedon in 451, according to *Dr. Walch*, (loc. cit. vol. vi. p. 611—619,) were in amount, as follows. Both held alike, (1) the perfect correctness of the Nicene Creed. And of course, (2) both held the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Godhead; (3) that God, the Word, was made flesh; (4) that *Christ* was truly God and truly man united; and (5) that, after the union of the two natures, he was *one person*. But *Eutyches* maintained, (6) that the two natures of *Christ* after the union, did not remain *two distinct* natures, but constituted *one nature*; and therefore (7) that it was correct to say, *Christ* was constituted *of* or *from* two natures; but not that he *existed in* two natures. For (8) the union of the two natures was such that, although neither of them was lost, or was essentially changed, yet together they constituted *one nature*; of which compound nature, and not of either of the original natures alone, must thenceforth be predicated each and every property of both natures. He accordingly denied, (9) that it is correct to say of *Christ*, that, as to his human nature, he was ὁμοῦστος (*of the same nature*) with us. It is to be remembered, that *Eutyches* was solicitous chiefly to confute *Nestorius*, who kept the two natures almost entirely distinct, and seemed to deny any other union than that of *purpose* and *cooperation*; and in particular he disliked all phrases which predicated the acts and sufferings of the *human* nature, of the *divine* nature: and to enable him to overturn this error, he so blended the two natures, that they could not afterwards be distinguished. Tr.]

(29) [This was an occasional council, assembled for other purposes, before which *Eusebius* appeared and accused *Eutyches*. The council peremptorily required him to give up his opinions; and on his refusal, proceeded at once to excommunicate him. See the Acts of this council, in *Harduin's Collection*, Tom. ii. p. 70 &c. See also *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vi. p. 108—158. Tr.]

Flavianus was severely scourged, and banished to Epipa, a city of Lydia, where he soon after died.(30) The Greeks call this Ephesine council, *σύνοδον ληστρικὴν*, an *Assembly of Robbers*; to signify that every thing was carried in it by fraud and violence. Yet this name would be equally applicable to many councils of this and the subsequent times.

§ 15. But the scene changed soon after. *Flavianus* and his adherents engaged *Leo* the Great, the Roman pontiff, on their side,—a course which was commonly taken in that age, by those who were foiled by their enemies,—and also represented to the emperor, that an affair of such magnitude demanded a general council to settle it. *Theodosius* however, could not be persuaded to grant the request of *Leo*, and call such a council. But on his death, *Marcian*, his successor, summoned a new council at Chalcedon, in the year 451, which is called the *fourth general council*. In this very numerous assembly, the legates of *Leo* the Great, (who had already publicly condemned the doctrine of *Eutyches*, in his famous Epistle to *Flavianus*,) were exceedingly active and influential. *Dioscorus* therefore was condemned, deposed, and banished to Paphlagonia; the Acts of the Ephesine council were rescinded; the Epistle of *Leo* was received as a rule of faith; *Eutyches*, who had already been divested of his clerical dignity and exiled by the emperor, was condemned though absent; and, not to mention the other decrees of the council, all christians were required to believe, what most to this day do believe, that in *Jesus Christ* there is but *one person*, yet *two distinct natures* no way confounded or mixed.(31)

(30) See *Jo. Harduin*, *Concilia*, Tom. i. p. 82 &c. *Liberatus*, *Breviarium*, c. xii. p. 76. *Leo Magn.* Epist. xciii. p. 625. *Nicephorus*, *Hist. Eccles. Lib.* xiv. c. 47. p. 550 &c. [*Walch*, *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 301 &c. and *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vi. p. 175—264. *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, (*Leo*) vol. ii. p. 42—48. ed. Lond. 1750. 4to. The aged emperor *Theodosius II.* was managed by the Etychians; and therefore he called such a council as would accomplish their wishes. In the council, *Eutyches* offered a confession of faith, which did not touch the point in debate; and this was accepted, without allowing his accusers to be heard. By acclamation the doctrine of *two natures* in the incarnate Word, was condemned. *Dioscorus* then proposed to condemn *Flavianus* and *Eusebius*. Here opposition was made: and *Dioscorus* called on the imperial commissioners, who threw open the doors of the church; a band of soldiers and an armed mob rushed in. The terrified bishops no longer resisted. Every member (in all, 149,) signed the decrees. *Flavianus* was deposed and banished. *Eusebius* of Doryleum, *Theodore*t of Cyprus, *Domnus* of Antioch, and several others were also deposed. The decisions of this council were ratified by the emperor, and ordered to be every where enforced. *Tr.*]

(31) [See the entire Acts of this council, in all the Collections of Councils; e. g. *Binnius*, and *Harduin*, Tom. ii. p. 1 &c. See also *Evagrius*, *Hist. Eccles. L.* ii. c. 2, 4. *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.* vol. i. p. 482—487. *Walch*, *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 307—314, and *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vi. p. 293—489. *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, (*Leo I.*) vol. ii. p. 56—100, ed. Lond. 1750. 4to.—The exposition of faith, in the 5th Action of this council, was designed to guard against both Eutychian and Nestorian errors. After recognizing the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* creeds, with *Leo's* Letter to *Flavianus*, &c. they say: "Following therefore these holy fathers, we unitedly declare, that

§ 16. This remedy, which was intended to heal the wounds of the church, was worse than the disease. For a great part of the oriental and Egyptian doctors, though holding various sentiments in other respects, agreed in a vigorous opposition to this council of Chalcedon, and to the Epistle of *Leo* the Great, which the council had adopted; and contended earnestly for *one nature* in *Christ*. Hence arose most deplorable discords, and civil wars almost exceeding credibility. In *Egypt*, the excited populace, after the death of the emperor *Marcian*, [AD. 457,] murdered *Proterius*, the successor of *Dioscorus*; and appointed in his place *Timotheus Aelurus*, a defender of the doctrine of *one incarnate nature*. And although *Aelurus* was expelled from his office, by the emperor *Leo*, yet under the succeeding emperor, *Basiliscus*, he recovered it. After his death, [AD. 476,] the friends of the council of Chalcedon elected *Timotheus*, surnamed *Salophaciolus*; and the advocates for one nature, chose *Peter Moggus*. But *Salophaciolus* being dead, in the year 482, *Moggus*, by order of the emperor *Zeno*, and by the influence of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople, obtained full possession of the see of Alexandria; and *John Talaia*, whom the Chalcedonians had elected, was removed. (32)

§ 17. In *Syria*, the abbot *Barsumas*, (a different person from *Barsumas* of Nisibis, a founder of the Nestorian sect,) having been condemned by the council of Chalcedon, went about propagating the doctrine of *Eutyches*. He also spread this doctrine among the neighboring Armenians, about the year 460, by means of his disciple *Samuel*. Yet from the harsher form of the Eutychian doctrine, the Syrians afterwards departed, under the guidance of *Zenaias*, or *Philoxenus*, the bishop of *Mabug*, [or *Hierapolis*,] and the famous *Peter* the *Fuller* [*Gnapheus* in Greek, and] *Fullo* in Latin. For these men denied, what *Eutyches* is said to have taught, that the human nature of *Christ* was

one and the same Son, our Lord *Jesus Christ*, is to be acknowledged, as being perfect in his Godhead, and perfect in his humanity; truly God, and truly man, with a rational soul and a body; of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father, as to his Godhead; and of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with us, as to his manhood; in all things like us, sin excepted; begotten (*γεννηθεῖς*) of the Father, from all eternity, as to his Godhead; and of *Mary*, the mother of God (*θεοτόκος*) in these last days, for us and for our salvation, as to his manhood; recognized as one Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten; of two natures, unconfounded, unchanged, undivided, inseparable (*ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίως*); the distinction of natures not at all done away by the union; but rather, the peculiarity (*ἰδιότης*) of each nature preserved, and combining (*συνερχέσθης*) into one substance (*ὑπόστασις*); not separated or divided into two persons (*πρόσωπα*); but one Son, Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord *Jesus Christ*: as the prophets before [taught] concerning him; so he, the Lord *Jesus Christ*, hath taught us, and the creed of the fathers hath transmitted to us." Tr.]

(32) See *Liberatus*, Breviarium, cap. 16, 17, 18. *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. c. 8. Lib. iii. c. 3. *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, Tom. ii. p. 410 &c.

absorbed in the divine ; and simply inculcated that Christ possessed *one nature*, and this a *twofold* or *compound* one. Still, as this doctrine was equally inconsistent with the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, the believers in it most stedfastly rejected that council.(33)

§ 18. *Peter*, who was surnamed the *Fuller*, because, while a monk, he pursued the trade of a fuller, got possession of the see of Antioch ; and although he was often ejected and condemned on account of his opposition to the council of Chalcedon, yet in the year 482, he obtained a full establishment in it, by authority of the emperor *Zeno*, and the influence of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople.(34) This man, who was formed to promote discord and controversy, occasioned new contests, and was looked upon as inclined to establish a new sect, which has been called the *Theopaschites*. Because, to the celebrated hymn which the Greeks call *Trisagium*, he recommended to the eastern churches the following addition, after the words, *O Holy God, O Holy Almighty, O Holy Eternal* : viz. *who wast crucified for us*. He undoubtedly made this addition with sectarian views, intending to establish men more firmly in his beloved doctrine, that of but *one nature* in Christ. But his adversaries, especially *Felix* of Rome, and others, perverted his meaning ; and maintained that he intended to teach, that *all the three persons* in the Godhead were crucified : and therefore such as approved this form of the hymn were called *Theopaschites*. The consequence of this dispute was, that the western christians rejected this form of the hymn, which they understood to refer to the whole Trinity ; but the oriental christians continued to use it constantly, even down to modern times, without offence, because they refer the hymn to *Christ as one person* in the Trinity.(35)

§ 19. To settle these manifold dissensions, which exceedingly disquieted both the church and the state, the emperor *Zeno*, in the year 482, by advice of *Acacius* the bishop of Constantinople, offered to the contending parties that *formula of concord*, which is commonly called his *Henoticon*. This formula repeated and confirmed all that had been decreed in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nesto-

(33) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. ii. p. 1—10. and his *Diss. de Monophysitis*, prefixed to this Tome, p. ii &c. [According to Dr. *Walch*, the parties were continually coming nearer together in doctrine, so that the *theological* dispute was sinking fast into a mere logomachy. But several questions of fact, or acts of the parties, became the subjects of lasting dispute and contention. See *Walch's Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vi. p. 796 &c. 825—832. Tr.]

(34) *Hen. Valesius*, *Diss. de Petro Fullone et de Synodis adversus eum collectis* ; annexed to his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.* Tom. iii. p. 173 &c.

(35) See *Hen. Noris*, *de uno ex Trinitate carne passo Liber*, in his *Opp.* Tom. iii. *Diss. i. c. 3.* p. 782. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. i. p. 518 &c. Tom. ii. p. 36, 180 &c. [and *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vii. p. 237 &c. 329 &c. 339 &c. Tr.]

rians, and Eutychians; but made no mention of the council of Chalcedon.(36) For *Zeno* had been led by *Acacius* to believe, that the opposition of the disaffected was, not to the doctrine of the council of Chalcedon, but to the council itself. This formula of concord was subscribed by the leaders of the *Monophysite* party, *Peter Moggus* bishop of Alexandria, and *Peter Fullō* bishop of Antioch. It was likewise approved by *Acacius* of Constantinople, and by all the more moderate of both parties. But the violent, on both sides, resisted it; and complained that this *Henoticon* did injustice to the council of Chalcedon (37) Hence arose new controversies, as troublesome as those which preceded.

§ 20. A considerable part of the *Monophysites* or *Eutychians*, considered *Peter Moggus* as having committed a great crime, by acceding to the *Henoticon*; and therefore they united in a new party, which was called that of the *Acephali*, because they were deprived of their head or leader.(38) Afterwards this sect became divided into three parties, the *Anthropomorphites*, the *Bar-*

(36) *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 14. *Liberatus*, Breviarium Histor. c. 18. [in both of which the *Henoticon* is given. Dr. Mosheim's description of this famous decree, is very imperfect. In it the emperor explicitly recognizes the creed of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan councils, as the only established and allowed creed of the church; and declares every person an alien from the true church, who would introduce any other. This creed, he says, was received by that council of Ephesus, which condemned *Nestorius*; whom, with *Eutyches*, the emperor pronounces to be heretics. He also acknowledges the 12 chapters of *Cyril* of Alexandria, to be sound and orthodox; and declares *Mary* to be the mother of God, and Jesus Christ to possess two natures, in one of which he was *ὁμοῦσιος* of like substance with the Father, and in the other, *ὁμοῦσιος* with us. Thus he fully recognized the doctrines of the council of Chalcedon, without alluding at all to that body: and affirming that these doctrines were embraced by all members of the true church, he calls upon all christians to unite on this sole basis; and "anathematizes every person, who has thought, or thinks, otherwise, either now, or at any other time, whether at Chalcedon, or in any other synod whatever; but more especially the aforesaid persons, *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, and such as embrace their sentiments:" and concludes with renewed exhortations to a union on this basis.—This formula of union was happily calculated to unite the more considerate of both parties. It required indeed some sacrifice of principle on the part of the *Monophysites*, or at least of their favorite phraseology; but it also required the dominant party to give up the advantage over their foes which they had obtained by the general council of Chalcedon. In Egypt, the *Henoticon* was extensively embraced; but the bishops of Rome were opposed to it, and were able to render it generally inefficient. Tr.]

(37) See *Facundus* Hermianensis, Defensio trium Capitulorum, L. xii. c. 4.

(38) *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iii. c. 13. *Leontius* Byzant. de Sectis, tom. i. Lektion. Antiquar. Hen. Canisii, p. 537. *Timotheus* Presbyter, in Joh. Bapt. Cotelier, Monument. Ecclesiae Graecae, tom. iii. p. 409. [From the time of the council of Chalcedon, the Eutychians gradually receded from the peculiar views of *Eutyches*, and therefore discarded the name of *Eutychians*, and assumed the more appropriate one of *Monophysites*, which indicated their distinguishing tenet, that the two natures of Christ were so united as to constitute but one nature. The whole party therefore, having long renounced *Eutyches* as their leader, when some of them also renounced *Peter Moggus*, they were indeed *Acephali*, without a head. Yet all the branches of this sect, continued to bear the name of *Monophysites*, till late in the 6th century, when *Jacobus Baradaeus* raised them up from extreme depression through persecution, and they assumed the name of *Jacobites*, a name which they bear to this day. Tr.]

sanuphites, and the *Esaianists*. And these sects were succeeded, in the next age by others, of which the ancients make frequent mention.(39) Yet the inquirer into the subject, must be informed, that some of these Eutychian sects are altogether imaginary; that others differed, not in reality, but only in terms; and that some were distinguished, not by their sentiments, but by some external rites and other outward circumstances. And they were all likewise of temporary duration; for in the next century, they all became extinct, through the influence especially of *Jacobus Baradaeus*.(40)

§ 21. The Roman pontiff *Felix III.* with his friends, attacked *Acacius* the bishop of Constantinople, who had favored the *Heno-ticon*, as a betrayer of the truth, and excluded him from church communion. To justify this hostility, *Felix* and his successors, taxed *Acacius* with favoring the Monophysites, and their leaders, *Peter Moggus* and *Peter Fullo*; with contempt for the council of Chalcedon; and with some other things. But in reality, as many facts demonstrate, *Acacius* became thus odious to the Roman pontiffs, because he denied by his actions the supremacy of the Roman see, and was extremely eager to extend the jurisdiction and advance the honor of the see of Constantinople. The Greeks defended the character and memory of their bishop, against the aspersions of the Romans. This contest was protracted till the following century, when the pertinacity of the Romans triumphed, and caused the names of *Acacius* and *Peter Fullo* to be stricken from the sacred registers, and consigned as it were to perpetual infamy.(41)

§ 22. The cause of this so great a series of evils, appears to be a very small thing. It is said that *Eutyches* believed, that the divine nature of Christ *absorbed* his human nature; so that *Christ* consisted of but *one nature*, and that the *divine*. Yet whether this was the fact or not, is not sufficiently clear. This sentiment however, together with *Eutyches*, was abandoned and rejected by the opposers of the council of Chalcedon, under the guidance of *Xenias* and *Peter Fullo*; and therefore, they are more properly called *Monophysites* than *Eutychians*. For all who are designated by this name, held that the divine and human natures of

(39) These sects are enumerated by *Ja. Basnage*, Prolegom. ad *Hen. Canisii* Lectiones Antiquas, cap. iii. and *Jos Sim. Asseman*, Diss. de Monophysitis, p. 7 &c.

(40) [For an account of *Jacobus Baradaeus*, and his labors in resuscitating the fallen sect of the Monophysites, see *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, Vol. viii. p. 481—491. Tr.]

(41) *Hen. Valesius*, Diss. de Synodis Romanis, in quibus damnatus est *Acacius*; subjoined to the third vol. of his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.* p. 179 &c. *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 301, 380, 381 &c. Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit. tom. i. Art. *Acacius* p. 75 &c. *Dav. Blondell* de la Primauté dans l'Eglise, p. 279 &c. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iii. Februarii, p. 502 &c. [*Boyer's* Lives of the Popes, (*Felix III.*) vol. ii. p. 198 &c. ed. Lond. 1750. 4to. Tr.]

Christ were so united as to constitute but *one nature*; yet without any conversion, confusion, or commixture: and that this doctrine might not be understood differently from their real meaning, they often said, there is but *one nature* in *Christ*, yet it is *two-fold* and *compound*.(42) With *Eutyches* they disclaimed all connexion; but they venerate *Dioscorus*, *Barsumas*, *Xenias*, and *Peter Fullo*, as pillars of their sect; and reject the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, together with the epistle of *Leo* the Great. The sentiments of the Monophysites, if we may judge from the language they used, appear to have differed from the doctrines established by the council of Chalcedon, in the mode of stating them, but not otherwise.(43) Yet if we attend carefully to the metaphysical arguments and subtleties, by which they supported their views,(44) perhaps we shall conclude, that their controversy with the Chalcedonians was not wholly a strife about words.

§ 23. Other troubles invaded the church in this century, from the West, and continued down through subsequent ages. *Pelagius*(45) and *Coelestius*,(46) the former a Briton, and the latter

(42) See the quotations from works of the Monophysites, by that excellent, and at times sufficiently ingenuous writer, *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135, 277, 297 &c.

(43) Many learned men consider this controversy as a mere strife about words. Among the *Monophysites*, *Gregory Abulpharajus*, the most learned of the sect, was of this opinion. *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 291. Add the *Biblioth. Italique*, tom. xvii. p. 285. *Matur. Veis. la Croze*, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*, p. 23. and *Hist. du Christ. d'Ethiopie*, p. 14 &c. Even *Asseman*, (*loc. cit.* p. 297,) though living at Rome, came near to avowing this opinion.

(44) See the subtle disputation of *Abulpharajus*, in *Asseman*, tom. ii. p. 283.

(45) [*Pelagius*, the heresiarch, was probably a Welchman, whose real name it is said was *Morgan* or *Marigena*, which was translated *πελάγιος Pelagius*. He was a British monk, went to Rome about the year 400, imbibed the opinions of *Origen*, and began to publish his heretical sentiments concerning original sin and free grace, about AD. 405. In the year 408, when the Goths were laying waste Italy, he and *Coelestius* retired to Sicily; and in 411, to Africa. *Coelestius* remained there, but *Pelagius* proceeded on to Egypt, to visit the monks of that country. In 415, he removed to Palestine, where he enjoyed the protection of *John*, bishop of Jerusalem. *Orosius*, (now in the East) impeached him; but he so far purged himself, before the council of Diospolis in 417, as to be acquitted. But the next year, he was condemned by the councils of Carthage and Milevi, as well as by the popes, *Innocent* and *Zosimus*: and the emperor *Honorius* ordered him and his adherents to be expelled from Rome. *Theodotus* of Antioch now held a council, which condemned him. His subsequent history is unknown.—He was a man of distinguished genius, learning, and sanctity. Yet he was accused of dissembling as to his real sentiments.—He wrote fourteen Books of *Commentaries* on Paul's Epistles;—(perhaps the very Books published among the works of *Jerome*, and ascribed to that father;) also an Epistle to Demetrius, de *Virginitate*, AD. 413; (falsely ascribed both to *Jerome* and to *Augustine*, and published as theirs;) a *Confession of his faith*, addressed to *Innocent*, bishop of Rome, AD. 417.—His last works are, *de Fide Trinitatis* Lib. iii.—*Liber ἐυλογιῶν* sive *Testimoniorum*; (Collections from scripture, in support of some doctrines;)—*de libero Arbitrio* Lib. iv.—*de Natura* Liber; and several Epistles.—See *Cave's Historia Litteraria*, i. p. 381 &c. *Tr.*]

(46) [*Coelestius*, of honorable birth, was a student at Rome when *Pelagius* arrived there. Embracing the views of his fellow islander, he accompanied him to

an Irishman, both monks living at Rome, and in high reputation for their virtues and piety, conceived that the doctrines taught by christians, concerning the innate depravity of man, and the necessity of internal divine grace in order to the illumination and renovation of the soul, were a great impediment to the progress of holiness, and therefore should be rooted out of the church. They therefore taught, that what was commonly inculcated and believed, respecting a corruption of the human nature, derived to us from our first parents, was not true; that the parents of the human race sinned, only for themselves, and not for their posterity; that men are now born as pure and innocent, as *Adam* was, when God created him; that men therefore can, by their natural power, renovate themselves, and reach the highest degree of holiness; that external grace is indeed needful, to excite men to efforts; but that they have no need of any internal divine grace.(47) These doctrines and those connected with them, the

Sicily in 408, and to Africa in 411, where he remained some years. In 412 he was accused before the bishop of Carthage for heresy, and condemned by a council there. He appealed to the bishop of Rome; but went to Ephesus, where he became a presbyter. He now disseminated his errors widely in Asia and the islands. In 416 he went to Constantinople, and the next year to Rome, when he so far satisfied *Zosimus*, as to obtain from him a recommendation to the bishops of Africa to restore him. But in 418 he was condemned by a synod at Rome, and was banished from the empire by the emperor. He now concealed himself in the East. In 429 the emperor forbid his coming to Constantinople. In 430, a synod at Rome condemned him; and also the council of Ephesus in 431. From that time, we hear no more of him. He wrote a confession of his faith, several Epistles, and some short pieces: but none of his works have reached us entire, except his confession of faith, and perhaps some Epistles among those of *Jerome*. See *Cave*, *Historia Litteraria*, tom. i. p. 384 &c. *Tr.*]

(47) [According to *Dr. Walch*, (*Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 735 &c.) as abridged by *Schegel*, the system of *Pelagius*, was as follows. (1) Men as they now come into the world, are, in respect to their powers and abilities, in the same state, in which *Adam* was created. (2) *Adam* sinned; but his sinning harmed no one but himself. (3) Human nature, therefore, is not changed by the fall: and death is not a punishment for sin; but *Adam* would have died, had he not apostatized. For death is inseparable from our nature; and the same is true of the pains of child-birth, diseases, and outward evils, particularly in children.(4) Much less is the guilt of *Adam's* sin imputed to his offspring; for God would be unjust, if he imputed to us the actions of others. (5) Such imputation cannot be proved, by the fact, that *Christ* has redeemed infants: for this redemption is to be understood of their heirship to the kingdom of heaven, from which, an heirship to another's guilt, will not follow. (6) Neither does the *baptism* of infants prove such an imputation: for they thereby obtain the kingdom of heaven, which *Christ* has promised only to *baptized* persons. (7) When children die without baptism, they are not therefore damned. They are indeed excluded from the kingdom of heaven, but not from eternal blessedness. For the Pelagians held to a threefold state after death: *damnation*, for sinners; the *kingdom of heaven*, for baptized christians who live a holy life, and for baptized children; and *eternal life*, for unbaptized children, and for unbaptized adults who live virtuous lives. (8) Much less is human nature *depraved*, in consequence of the fall of *Adam*. There is therefore no hereditary sin. (9) For, though it may be granted, that *Adam* is so far the author of sin, as he was the *first* that sinned, and by his example has seduced others; yet this is not to be understood of a *propagation* of sin by generation. (10) This supposed propagation of sin is the less admissible, because it would imply a *propagation of souls*, which is not true. (11) Neither can such a propagation be maintained, without impeaching the justice of God,

above mentioned monks secretly disseminated at Rome. But in the year 410, on account of the invasion of the Goths, they retired from Rome, and going first to Sicily, and thence to Africa, they more openly advanced their opinions. From Africa, *Pelagius* went to Egypt; but *Coelestius* continuing at Carthage, solicited a place among the presbyters of that city. But his novel opinions being detected, he was condemned in a council at Carthage AD. 412; and leaving the country, he went to Asia.

introducing unconditional necessity, and destroying our freedom. (12) It is true, there are in men sinful propensities; in particular, the propensity for sexual intercourse; but these are not sins. (13) If sin was propagated by natural generation, and every motion of the sinful propensities, and every desire therefor, were sinful, then the marriage state would be sinful. (14) As man has ability to sin, so has he also, not only ability to discern what is good, but likewise power to desire it and to perform it. And this is the freedom of the will, which is so essential to man, that he cannot lose it. (15) The *grace*, which the scriptures represent as the source of morally good actions in man, *Pelagius* understood to denote various things. For he understood the word (a) of the whole constitution of our nature, and especially of the endowment of *free will*: (b) of the promulgation of the divine law: (c) of the forgiveness of past sins, without any influence on the future conduct: (d) of the example of *Christ's* holy life, which he called the *grace of Christ*: (e) of the internal change in the understanding, whereby the truth is recognized; which he called *grace*, and also the *assistance* of the Holy Spirit: (f) and sometimes *grace*, with him, was equivalent to *baptism* and *blessedness*. (16) Man is as capable of securing salvation, by the proper use of his powers, as of drawing on himself damnation, by the misuse of them. (17) And therefore God has given men a law; and this law prescribes nothing impossible. (18) God requires from men a perfect, personal obedience to his law. (19) Actions originating from ignorance or forgetfulness, are not sinful. (20) So also natural propensities or the craving of things sinful, is not of itself sinful. (21) Therefore perfect personal obedience to the law, on the part of men, is practicable, through the uncorruptness of the powers of nature. (22) And by *grace*, (consisting in external divine aids, the right use of which depends on men's free will,) good works are performed. They did not deny all internal change in men by *grace*; but they confined it solely to the *understanding*, and controverted all internal change of the *will*. They also limited the necessity of this *grace*, by maintaining that it was not indispensable to all men; and that it only *facilitated* the keeping of God's commandments. (23) This possibility of performing good works by the free use of our natural powers, they endeavored to prove, by the existence of virtuous persons among the pagans: and likewise (24) from the saints mentioned in the Old Testament; whom they divided into two classes, the *first*, from Adam to Moses, who, like the pagans, had only natural *grace*; the *second*, from Moses to Christ, who had the *grace of the law*. Some of the saints, who had the law, were all their lifetime without sin; others sinned indeed, but being converted, they ceased to sin, and yielded a perfect obedience to the law. (25) The *grace*, whereby perfect obedience becomes possible, is a consequence of precedent good works: (26) and such obedience is absolutely necessary to salvation. (27) Sins, originating from a misuse of human freedom, and continued by imitation and by custom, were forgiven, under the Old Testament, solely on account of good works; and under the New Testament, through the *grace of Christ*. (28) Their idea of the way of salvation, then, was this. A man who has sinned, converts himself; that is, he leaves off sinning, and this by his own powers. He believes on *Christ*; that is, he embraces his doctrines. He is now baptized; and on account of this baptism, all his previous sins are forgiven him, and he is without sin. He has the instructions and the example of *Christ*, whereby he is placed in a condition to render perfect obedience to the divine law. This he *can* do, if he will; and he can either withstand all temptations, or fall from *grace*. (29) Moreover they admitted conditional decrees; the condition of which was, either foreseen good works, or foreseen sin. Tr.]

From this time, *Augustine*, the famous bishop of Hippo, began to assail with his pen the doctrines of *Pelagius* and *Coelastius*; and to him chiefly, is due the honor of suppressing this sect at its very birth.(48)

§ 24. *Pelagius* was more fortunate in the East. For under the patronage of *John*, bishop of Jerusalem, who considered the doctrines of *Pelagius* as according with the opinions of *Origen*, to which *John* was attached, *Pelagius* freely professed his sentiments, and gathered disciples. And although he was impeached in the year 415, by *Orosius*, a Spanish presbyter, whom *Augustine* had sent into Palestine; yet a convention of bishops at Jerusalem, dismissed him without censure; and a little after, in a council held at Diospolis in Palestine, he was acquitted of every crime and error.(49) The controversy being removed to Rome,

(48) The history of the Pelagians has been written by many persons: as by *Ja. Usher*, in his *Antiquitat. ecclesiae Britan.* *Joh. a Laet*, a Netherlander; *Ger. Joh. Vossius*; *Hen. Noris*; *Jo. Garnier*, in his *Supplement to the works of Theodoret*; *Cornel. Jansen*, in his *Augustinus*; and others. The French Jesuit, *Jac. de Longueval* left a MS *Historia Pelagiana*. See his Preface to the 9th vol. of his *History of the Gallican church*, p. iv. But among so many writers, no one yet has exhausted the whole subject, or shown himself free from undue partiality. [This partiality is to be attributed to the renewal of these controversies. In all ages there have been some in the christian church, who coincided, either wholly or partially, with *Pelagius*, and who opposed the doctrine of *Augustine*. On the other hand, the scholastics adopted the greatest part of *Augustine's* sentiments. And these two parties have never been at rest. The affair with *Gotteschalvus*, and the contests between the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*, kept up these disquietudes; and in the times of the reformation, the commotions were increased, when *Luther* and *Erasmus* came upon the arena, and the council of Trent made a considerable part of the Pelagian system to be articles of faith. From that period onward, the protestants have maintained, that the Catholic church holds, not what *Augustine* taught, but what *Pelagius*, or at least the Semi-Pelagians inculcated; and the Catholic doctors endeavor to maintain the contrary. The Dominicans and the Jesuits, and also the Jesuits and Jansenists, have likewise moved controversies within their own church, respecting Pelagianism and the opinions of *Augustine*: and among the Protestants, the charge of Pelagianism has been brought against the Arminians, and likewise against various individual doctors. No wonder therefore, if all these learned writers of the Pelagian history, are often betrayed into errors, by the prejudices of their party. *Schl.*—*Dr. Walch's* account, is full and candid, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 519—846. and for the *Semi-Pelagians*, vol. v. p. 3—228. *Münscher's* statement of the opinions of the different parties, is lucid and well vouched; *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. iv. p. 122—262. *Tr.*]

(49) See *Gabr. Daniel*, *Histoire du Concile de Diospolis*, among the shorter works of this eloquent and learned Jesuit, published, Paris 1724, 3 vol. 4to. in tom. i. p. 635—671. [Our whole information respecting these councils is derived from the opposers of *Pelagius*, *Orosius*, *Augustine* &c. The first was held at Jerusalem, in the month of July, 415. It was merely an assemblage of presbyters, with bishop *John* for president. *Pelagius* and the council spoke Greek; but *Orosius*, the accuser, Latin only. This gave great advantage to *Pelagius*. *Orosius* stated what had been done in Africa: *Pelagius* said, he had no concern with those councils. *Orosius* was called upon to make his charges specific against *Pelagius*. He then stated, that he had heard *Pelagius* affirm, that a man may become sinless, if he will; and that it is an easy thing to obey the law of God perfectly. *Pelagius* explained, that he meant it should be understood, with the aids of divine grace. The council were satisfied with this explanation. The second council which sat at Diospolis or Lydda, in December 415, was composed of 14

Zosimus, (who was made pontiff in the year 417,) being taken in, partly by the ambiguous and apparently sound confession of faith, which *Coelestius* then residing at Rome offered, and partly by the flattering and insidious letters and protestations of *Pelagius*, pronounced sentence in favor of these monks, and decided, that wrong had been done to these men of correct sentiments, by their adversaries.(50) But the Africans, led on by *Augustine*, continued perseveringly to assail them with councils, books, and letters. *Zosimus* therefore, being better informed, changed his opinion, and severely condemned those, whom he had before extolled. Afterwards, that Ephesine council, which hurled its thunders against *Nestorius*, also condemned them; and now the Gauls, the Britons, and the Palestinians, by their councils, and the emperors, by their laws and penalties, crushed the sect in its commencement.(51)

§ 25. These unhappy contests produced, as is often the case, other dissensions equally hurtful. As *Augustine* did not at first state, with sufficient uniformity and clearness, his opinions respecting the divine grace, necessary to salvation, and the decrees of God in regard to the future condition of individual men, he gave occasion to certain monks of Adrumetum and to some persons in Gaul, to believe, that God has *predestinated the wicked, not only to suffer eternal punishment, but also to commit sin, and to incur the guilt which will merit that punishment*; and of course, to believe, that *both the good and the sinful actions of men were, from all eternity divinely predetermined and fixed, by an inevitable necessity*. These persons were called *Predestinarians*. Yet this doctrine did not spread far; for *Augustine* more clearly explained his views, and two councils, at Arles and Lyons, publicly disapproved of it.(52) There are however, very learned men,

bishops. The accusers were two Gallic bishops, *Heros* and *Lazarus*, but neither of them present. They sent in a long list of errors, which they said *Pelagius* and his followers had taught. *Pelagius* replied, that these were not *his* opinions, that he anathematized them, and that he believed what the Catholic church had always held. With this the council were satisfied. But the sentence of the Africans still remained in force: and therefore *Pelagius* and *Coelestius* both sought the interference of the bishop of Rome. Tr.]

(50) See *Jo. Frick*, *Zosimus in Clemente xi. redivimus*, Ulm. 1719, 4to. [and *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, (*Zosimus*) vol. i. p. 334 &c. ed. Lond. 1749, 4to. Tr.]

(51) See *Ger. Jo. Vossius*, *Historia Pelagiana*, L. i. c. 55. p. 130. There are also some learned remarks on this controversy in the *Bibliothèque Italique*, tom. v. p. 74 &c. The writers on both sides are enumerated by *Jo. Fr. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad Theol.* tom. ii. p. 1071. *W. Wall* has likewise given a neat and learned, though imperfect, history of the Pelagian contest, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, vol. i. ch. 13. [p. 192—282. ed. Lond. 1705.] which his learned translator [into Latin, *J. L. Schlosser*,] has enriched with excellent remarks.

(52) See *Ja. Sirmond*, *Historia Praedestiniana*, Tom. iv. of his *Opp.* p. 271 &c. *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. Liv. xii. cap. ii. p. 698. *Dion. Petarius*, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. vi. p. 168, 174 &c. [According to *W. Münscher*, (*Dogmengeschichte*, vol. iv. p. 164 &c. 215 &c.) all the fathers, before *Augustine*, held to a *conditional election*, that is, an election founded on the foreseen good

who deny that such a sect of *Predestinarians* ever had existence; and who maintain, that the followers of *Augustine*, while inculcating his doctrines truly and correctly, were undeservedly reproached, by the Semi-Pelagians, with these so great errors.(53)

works of men. So *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Hilary* of Poitiers, *Ambrose*, *Jerome*. They likewise held, that *Christ* died for *all* men; and were strangers to the idea of an atonement made only for the *elect*. So *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Athanasius*, *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, and *Jerome*. They also held, that the saints may, and do, fall from grace and perish. So *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Athanasius*, and *Hilary*. Even *Augustine* himself in the earlier part of his ministry, held election to be conditional. But as early as the year 397, he discovered that such an election was inconsistent with man's entire dependence on grace for ability to perform good works; a doctrine, which he held most firmly. He therefore advanced the new theory, that God's electing some to everlasting life, depended upon his mere good pleasure, in view of reasons known only to himself: that God from eternity predestinated some to repentance, faith, good works, and ultimately to salvation; while others he left to go on in sin, and perish everlastingly: that the number of the elect is fixed unalterably and forever: that this election of some to salvation through grace, while others are left without grace, and perish in their sins, is no injustice on the part of God; because *all* men *deserve* to be left in their sins. He denied, that God really *wills* the salvation of *all* men; and he justified preaching the Gospel to all, on the ground that *we* know not who are elected and who are not.—When this theory was advanced by *Augustine*, it met with opposition; and it was not, by those who embraced it, always stated as guardedly as it was by its author. Hence, those opposed to it, drew the frightful picture of it, which has been called *Predestinarianism*. This system, as stated by *Dr. Münscher* (*ibid.* p. 257,) embraced the following positions; namely, that the wicked are predestinated, not only to punishment, but also to commit sin; that baptism does not remove all sin; that the godliness of the righteous does not profit them; nor will the wicked be damned on account of their sins; that, in general, God will not judge men according to their deeds; that it is useless to address exhortations either to saints or sinners. *Dr. Münscher* subjoins: All these were *consequences* drawn from the doctrine of unconditional decrees taught by *Augustine*; but they were consequences which he expressly rejected. *Tr.*]

(53) See *Gilb. Mauguin*, *Fabula praedestinationiana confutata*; which he subjoined to a *Collection* of various authors, who wrote in the 9th century concerning predestination and grace, vol. ii. p. 447 &c. Paris 1650, 4to. [*Mauguin* was a French statesman, who with much theological and historical learning, maintained with the Jansenists, against the Jesuits, that there never were any *Predestinarians*. *Schl.*] *Fred. Spanheim*, *Introduct. ad Historiam Eccles.* in his *Opp.* tom. i. p. 993. *Ja. Basnage*, *Adnot. ad Prosperi Chronicon*, and *Praefat. ad Faustum Regiensem*. *Hen. Canisius*, *Lectio. Antiquar.* tom. i. p. 315, 348. The author of the *Life of Jo. Launoi*, in his *Works*, tom. iv. P. ii. p. 343, namely *Granet*, informs us, that *Sirmond* encouraged *Launoi* to undertake a refutation of *Mauguin*; but *Launoi*, having examined the subject, fell in with the opinions of *Mauguin*. [*Father Sirmond* was a champion against the Jesuits, who were charged by the Jansenists with departing from the opinions of *Augustine*; and he hoped to confute this charge, if he could only demonstrate, incontrovertibly, that there really was a sect of *Predestinarians* existing in the times of *Augustine*. *Sirmond* had published an ancient book, at Paris, 1643, bearing the title: *Praedestinatus, sive Praedestinatorum haeresis, et libri S. Augustino temere adscripti refutatio*. The work consists of three Books. The *first* contains a list of heresies; of which that of the *Predestinarians* is the 90th. The *second* Book bears the superscription: *Liber secundus, sub nomine Augustini confictus, nonagessimam haeresin continens, quae asserit, Dei praedestinatione peccata committi*. The *third* Book contains a refutation of the supposed tract of *Augustine*. This work is certainly ancient, and most probably to be ascribed to the younger *Arnobius*. But the credibility of its statements is much impaired, by the fact that its author was a Semi-Pelagian, and wrote more as a polemic, than as a historian. *Schl.*]—This petty dispute, whether there was in ancient times a sect of *Predestinarians*, when

§ 26. On the other hand, *John Cassianus*, a monk who came to Marseilles in France from the East, and established a monastery there, together with some others, about the year 430, endeavored to modify in some measure the system of *Augustine*.(54) Many persons falling in with their views, the sect was

thoroughly examined, will perhaps turn out to be a contest about terms. [To the question, whether there existed in the 5th and 6th centuries a sect of Predestinarians, some of the learned have answered, *yes*; and others, *no*. Those who answer in the latter manner, believe the sect of Predestinarians was a fiction of the Semi-Pelagians, who used this name in order to bring odium on *Augustine* and his followers. This opinion was embraced by the Jansenists, the Reformed, and among the Lutherans by *Dr. Semler*, in his History of religious doctrines, prefixed to the 3d vol. of *Baumgarten's* Polemic Theology. Those who answer the question affirmatively, are divisible into two classes. They admit directly, that there were Predestinarians, who were condemned by the orthodox church; yet they deny that *Augustine* taught, what they admit to have been the errors of this sect. Of this opinion were the Jesuits, and the early Lutheran divines.] Others, while they admit all this, add, that the opposers of the sect were principally Semi-Pelagians, who aimed to bring contempt on the Augustinian doctrine. They hold, that only a few individual persons, as a few monks of Adrumetum and *Lucidus*, fell into these errors; and therefore they never constituted a distinct sect or heretical community. This opinion has been defended by *Noris* and *Graveson* among the Catholics, by the two *Basnages* among the Reformed, and in the Lutheran church, by *Pfaff*, *Buddeus*, the elder *Walch*, and *Dr. Bernhold* in a disputation at Altdorf, 1737; and it is admitted by the younger *Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. 280 &c. Among those who regard the whole question, respecting the existence of a Predestinarian sect, as a contest about words, besides *Dr. Mosheim*, may be reckoned *Weismann*, in his *Memorabil. Hist. Eccl.* tom. i. p. 410 &c. And in fact, there is something like a contest about words, in the dispute whether there was really a Predestinarian sect. For very much depends on the definition of the word *sect* or *heresy*. If the term is used to denote a society of persons who have a particular mode of worship; then a Predestinarian sect never had existence. But if the term denote a set of religious opinions, embraced and defended by individual persons, here and there, but who never separated from the general church; then it may be said, there was a sect of Predestinarians. When we view the controversy in all its extent, we can by no means regard it as a controversy about words. See *Walch*, *Hist. der Ketzer*. vol. v. p. 218—288. *Schl.*]

(54) [The views of *John Cassianus* are exhibited in his *Collatio xiii. Patrum*, Opp. p. 491 &c. and are well abridged by *Dr. Muenscher* (*Dogmengesch.* vol. iv. p. 246 &c.) as follows. As *John Cassianus* is the only writer of those times, who has exhibited a connected view of the doctrines of the so called Massilians; from his works alone can the deviations of these teachers from the opinions of *Augustine* be derived. His primary object was, to exhibit the true worth and the necessity of divine grace, but without overthrowing the freedom of the human will. Man, said he, needs at all times divine aid; and he can do nothing to secure his salvation, without it. But he must not be inactive, on his part. All men have indeed original sin, and are subject to death; but a knowledge of God, and their free will, they have not lost. It can neither be maintained, that the commencement of what is good in us, always originates from God, nor that it always originates from ourselves. Sometimes it is of God, who first excites good thoughts and purposes in us. But sometimes it is the man, who takes the first step; and whom God then meets with his assistance. In either case, it is God who, when he sees the spark of goodness glimmering in the soul, or has himself lighted it up, by his own working, cherishes and sustains this spark. God's unchangeable will is, that all men may be saved; and when any one is lost, it is contrary to his designs. At all times therefore the grace of God is co-operating with our will, and strengthens and defends it; yet so, that he sometimes waits for, or requires from us, some efforts to choose what is good, that he may not seem to confer his gifts on the indolent and inactive. The grace of God however is always unmerited, as it bestows on the weak and worthless efforts of men, such

produced, which its adversaries have called that of the *Semi-Pelagians*. The sentiments of the *Semi-Pelagians* are represented differently, by those that oppose them. The greater part however represent them as holding, that men do not need *internal, preventing grace*; but that every man can, by his natural powers, commence the renovation of his soul; and can have and exercise faith in *Christ*, and a purpose of living a holy life: yet that no man can persevere in the begun course, unless he is constantly supported by divine assistance and grace. The disciples of *S. Augustine* in Gaul, contended warmly with this class of men; but they could not vanquish them.(55) For, as their doc-

valuable favors and such unfading glory. The ways in which God brings men to possess goodness, are manifold and incomprehensible; but he always treats each individual, according to his character and desert. Yet this is not to be understood, as if grace was imparted to each one according to his merits. On the contrary, the grace of God far transcends all human desert, and sometimes transcends the unbelief of men, (i. e. brings the unbelieving to have faith.) From these propositions, (which are arranged differently from what they are by the author, but are expressed in almost his own words,) it appears, that *Cassian* rejected unconditional election, the inability of man to do good, irresistible grace, and the Augustinian idea of the saints perseverance. Dr. *Muensch* adds, that the principal point in which the Massilians departed from the adherents to *Augustine*, lay in this, that man has, in his freedom of will, some power to do good; by exerting which, he does not indeed *merit* the grace of God, yet he makes himself *fit* to receive it; and that God, in view of these human efforts, has determined to bestow his grace and eternal bliss.—The evidence by which the Massilians supported their opinions, was various. Their chief argument was this, that in the scriptures, faith and virtue are sometimes *required* of men, and sometimes represented as the *gift* of God; and these different passages cannot be reconciled, unless it be allowed, that faith and virtue come principally from God, and yet that free will has some part in them. This doctrine moreover, they said, coincided with the standing belief of the church; while the opposite doctrine was new, and also objectionable, because it annihilated human freedom, introduced an unavoidable necessity in human actions, and by holding up the idea that a man's own efforts were of no avail, encouraged men to remain inactive. Tr.]

(55) *Jas. Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, Tome ii. Liv. xii. cap. i. Histoire litteraire de la France, Tome ii. Pref. p. ix &c. *Vossius*, Historia Pelagiana, Lib. vi. p. 538 &c. *Irenaeus Veronensis*, i. e. *Scipio Maffei*, de Haeresi Semipelagiana, in the Opuscula scientifica of *Angel. Calogera*, Tom. xxix. p. 399 &c. [As soon as *Augustine* was informed, by *Prosper* and *Hilary*, of the existence of these opposers of his system, at Marseilles, he wrote his two pieces designed to confute them, de Praedestinatione Sanctorum Liber, and de Dono perseverantiae Liber, both addressed to *Prosper* and *Hilary*. Soon afterwards, AD. 430, *Augustine* died; and *Prosper* and *Hilary* carried on the controversy. In 431, they visited Rome, and obtained the patronage of *Coelestine* the pontiff: but not succeeding by means of councils and popes, *Prosper* applied himself to writing against the errorists. His strictures on *Cassian's* 13th Collation, is a valuable performance. The Libri ii. de vocatione Gentium, (i. e. on the universality of the call to embrace the Gospel salvation, seems not to be his: for it does not come up fully to his views, as expressed in his reply to *Cassian*. Though it concedes more to the Semi-Pelagians, than *Augustine* and *Prosper* did, still it was on the same side. The majority in France, as well as nearly all the Greeks, were in sentiment with the Semi-pelagians. About the year 472, one *Lucidus*, a presbyter, having avowed pure Augustinianism, *Faustus*, bishop of Reiz in Gaul, wrote him a letter; and afterwards accused him before the council of Arles, AD. 475. The council disapproved the sentiments of *Lucidus*, who retracted; and they encouraged *Faustus* to write his ii Books de libero Arbitrio, in opposition to *Augustine's* views. A few months after, a synod at Lyons, also decided in favor

trines coincided with the modes of thinking of the majority of people, and particularly the monks, and were approved by the most respectable authors, especially among the Greeks ; and as *Augustine* himself, and his friends, did not venture utterly to reject and condemn them as pernicious and impious ; no efforts could prevent them from spreading far and wide.

§ 27. From this period, therefore, commenced those knotty controversies, concerning the nature and the mode of that divine agency, or grace, which is necessary for our salvation; which have unhappily divided christians, in every subsequent age, and which are still protracted, to the grief of all the pious and good. Many in all ages have followed the system of *Augustine*, who ascribed

of Semi-Pelagian sentiments. But early in the following century, *Caesarius* of Arles, came out a zealous Augustinian ; and with the aid of some Scythian monks, and some others, he caused that doctrine to spread and to gain the ascendancy. The synods of Orange and Valence, AD. 529, declared in favor of it. The opposers of Augustinianism were in that age denominated *Pelagians* ; from their leaning towards the sentiments of Pelagius ; also *Massilians*, from the residence of their principal writers at (*Massilia*) *Marseilles*. It was the schoolmen of after ages, who denominated them *Semi-Pelagians*.—According to Dr. *Walch*, they admitted original sin ; but probably confined its effects to our liability to temporal death. They supposed all the posterity of *Adam* have ability to discern what is right, and freedom of will to choose it : yet that none can be saved, but by grace, through *Christ*, by means of his blood and a christian baptism ; that *Christ* died for *all* men ; that God wills the salvation of all ; and therefore proffers his grace to all ; so that all men *may* be saved, if they will. The way of salvation, they supposed, is, to believe, to practice virtue, and to persevere in it to the end. Faith is, believing that God has determined to save all that obey the Gospel. This faith originates altogether from our free will. From the same source, and from the use of our natural powers, originate the beginnings of a right temper, the desiring, seeking, and knocking. Yet neither this faith, nor these beginnings of a right temper, are *good works* ; that is, they have no proper efficacy to *merit* the assistance of God, or that grace which is necessary to the performance of good works ; and yet they may induce God to impart his grace. Thus it is God who gives the grace, by which faith is strengthened, and good works performed ; yet its due influence must be allowed to free will, and not every thing be ascribed to grace. The connexion and co-operation of both, are very necessary ; for grace only helps or assists. True faith may be lost ; its retention depends solely on man's free will ; and it is not true, that divine grace imparts to man a special gift of perseverance in goodness. God has a twofold decree, respecting man's salvation ; *first*, his general desire that all may be saved ; and *secondly*, his design actually to save those who shall persevere in holiness to the end. *Augustine's* doctrine of predestination is very objectionable ; it wholly subverts man's freedom ; makes God the author of sin ; and renders it vain to exhort sinners to repent, or saints to persevere in religion. Election to salvation is conditional, depending on the foreseen conduct of men in regard to obedience to the divine commands. To the puzzling question of their opposers, what becomes of so many baptized children, who die before they are competent to exert their free will ; and of so many adults who never were favored with a knowledge of the Gospel ; they replied, *first*, that baptized children, dying in infancy, are saved, on the ground that God foresaw they would persevere in religion if their lives had been prolonged ; and *secondly*, that so many children as die without baptism, are deprived of that ordinance, and so many adults as are deprived of a knowledge of the Gospel, (both being doomed to damnation,) suffer these privations, because God foresaw, that the former would not live virtuously, and that the latter would not embrace the Gospel, if they had an opportunity. See Dr. *Walch's* ample account of this religious party, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 3—218. Tr.]

every thing to the grace of God, and nothing to human sufficiency ; yet they differed in the manner in which they explained this system. But a still greater number have agreed with *Cassian* ; whose system, though differently explained, has spread from the schools of the Gallic monks over all the nations of Europe. The Greeks and the other orientals held the same views, before *Cassian* ; nor have they departed from them to this day. The opinions of *Pelagius* appeared to most persons, too bold and loose ; and therefore were never openly avowed by large numbers. Yet in every age, some may be found, who ascribed to man, as it is said *Pelagius* did, full power, by his own strength, to keep the whole law of God.

CENTURY SIXTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Progress of christianity in the East—§ 2. and in the West.—§ 3. Jews converted in several places.—§ 4. The miracles of this century.

§ 1. It appears evident from the historical records of the Greek empire, that several barbarous tribes, especially among those resident near the Black Sea, were converted to christianity by the efforts of the Greek emperors and the bishops of Constantinople. Among these were the *Abasgi*, a barbarous nation inhabiting the country between the coasts of the Euxine sea and mount Caucasus, who embraced christianity under the emperor Justinian.(1) The *Heruli*, who dwelt along the other side of the Ister [or Danube,] became christians under the same reign : (2) also the *Alani*, the *Lazi*, and the *Zani*, and some other tribes, whose residence is not definitely known at the present day.(3) But there is abundant evidence, that nothing was required of these nations except

(1) *Procopius*, de Bello Gothico, Lib. iv. c. 3. *le Quien*, *Oriens Christianus*, Tom. i. p. 1351 &c. [Their adoration (like that of the ancient Germans) had been previously given to forests and lofty trees. The emperor *Justinian* sent priests among them, and erected a church for them dedicated to the virgin *Mary*: and he rendered the people more inclined to become christians, by prohibiting their king from carrying on a shameful traffic in eunuchs. See the authors referred to by *Dr. Mosheim*. Tr.]

(2) *Procopius*, de Bello Gothico, L. ii. c. 14.

(3) [See *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 20, 22, 23. All these conversions took place near the commencement of the reign of *Justinian*, about AD. 430. Tr.]

externally to profess *Christ*, cease from offering victims to their gods, and learn certain forms to be repeated : the imbuing their minds with true religion and piety, was not even thought of. It is certain, that after their conversion, they retained their rude and savage manners, and were famous for rapines, murders, and every species of iniquity. In most provinces of the Greek empire, and even in the city of Constantinople, many idolaters were still lurking in concealment. A great multitude of these were baptized, during the reign of *Justin*, by *John* bishop of Asia.(4)

§ 2. In the West, *Remigius* bishop of Rheims, who has been called the *Apostle of the Gauls*, labored with great zeal to convert idolaters to *Christ*; and not without success, especially after *Clovis*, the king of the Franks, had embraced christianity.(5) In Britain, *Ethelbert* king of Kent, the most distinguished of the seven Anglo-Saxon kings among whom the island was then divided, married near the close of this century a christian wife named *Bertha*, the daughter of *Cherebert* king of Paris; and she, partly by her own influence, and partly by that of the ministers of religion whom she brought with her, impressed her husband favorably towards christianity. The king being thus prepared for it, *Gregory* the Great, at the suggestion undoubtedly of the queen, sent forty Benedictine monks, with one *Augustine* at the head of them, into Britain, in the year 596, to complete the work which the queen had begun. This *Augustine*, with the queen's assistance, converted the king and the greatest part of the inhabitants of Kent to christian worship, and laid the foundation of the modern British church.(6) Among the *Picts* and *Scots*, *Columbas*,

(4) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. ii. p. 85.

(5) *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Tome iii. p. 155 &c.

(6) *Beda*, *Histor. Eccles. gentis Anglor.* Lib. i. c. 23. p. 55 &c. ed. Chifflet. *Rapin Thoyras*, *Hist. d' Angleterre*, Tome i. p. 222 &c. *Acta Sanctor.* Tom. iii. Februar. p. 470. where is an account of *Ethelbert*, king of Kent. [The marriage of *Berta*, is said to have been consummated AD. 579. It had been stipulated, that she should enjoy her own religion and worship. She therefore had her private chaplain, and a small church. *Gregory* the Great, before he was made pope, was so captivated with the beauty of some English youth offered for sale at Rome as slaves, that he wished to go himself as a missionary to England; but the Roman people restrained him. He was created pontiff in 590; and in 596, persuaded *Augustine*, abbot of St. Andrews at Rome, to undertake the conversion of the English nation. *Augustine* with a small retinue of monks, set forward; but he scarcely reached France, before the courage of the whole party failed, and *Augustine* returned to obtain leave to abandon the enterprize. *Gregory* however would not give it up; he exhorted *Augustine* to proceed, assigned him more assistants, gave him letters of introduction to bishops and princes on the way, and dismissed him. *Augustine* now proceeded through France, crossed the channel, and landed with his 40 monks on the isle of Thanet in Kent. There king *Ethelbert* met him, learned his object, gave him access to the country, promised him protection and sustenance, but refused to embrace the new religion till after further examination. *Augustine* and retinue now marched to Canterbury the capitol, with a waving banner, and a silver crucifix, chanting: *O Lord, we beseech thee, in thy great mercy, to remove thy fury and thy wrath from this city, and from thine house, for we have sinned: hallelujah.* For a considerable time, *Augustine* and his monks worshipped in the queen's chapel; and fast-

an Irish monk, began the work of administering christian baptism.(7) In Germany, the *Bohemians*, the *Thuringians*, and

ed, and prayed, and chanted hymns, almost constantly. The next year, AD. 597, the king had his mind made up, was baptized, and allowed, but did not compel, any of his subjects to follow his example. In a short time however, all Kent was nominally christian. Having been so successful, *Augustine* this year, went to Gaul, and was ordained archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England; and returned with a fresh accession of monks. In the year 598, he sent two monks, *Laurentius* and *Peter*, to Rome, to inform *Gregory* of the prosperous state of the mission. *Gregory* exulted in its success, and sent back the messengers, with additional laborers, the pall for the new archbishop, numerous presents for the cathedral, including holy relics, letters to the king and queen &c. He confirmed *Augustine's* jurisdiction over all England, exhorted him to proceed with his work, advised him not to demolish the pagan temples, but to convert them into churches, purifying them with holy water; for the pagans would love to worship in the places long held sacred; yet the idols must be destroyed. He also advised, that the people be allowed on festal days to assemble around the churches, erect booths, and there feast themselves, much as during their pagan state; yet without sacrificing to their idols. *Gregory* likewise answered several questions of *Augustine*, advising him and his associates to continue to live in monasteries, to use such a liturgy as should seem best suited to the country; and instructing him how thieves should be treated, how many bishops must concur in the ordination of a bishop, how he must demean himself among the Gallic bishops, and what was to be thought of some ceremonial impurities. In 602, *Augustine* built his cathedral at Canterbury; and he erected a monastery in which to train men for the ministry. In the year 604, he attempted to bring under his jurisdiction, and to a conformity with his churches, all the clergy and churches of the ancient Britons, whom the Saxons had conquered and driven chiefly into Wales. A council was held for the purpose. But as *Augustine* was quite bigoted and somewhat overbearing, nothing was effected. In the meantime, the conversion of other Saxons, beyond the kingdom of Kent, proceeded successfully; and several bishops were ordained, particularly a bishop for London, and another for Rochester. St. Paul's church in London was now founded; and the next year the *West monastery* (*Westminster*), adjoining London. In the year 607, *Augustine* died, and was succeeded in the see of Canterbury by *Laurentius*. See *Beda*, Hist. Eccl. Brit. Lib. i. c. 23 &c. and Lib. ii. c. 2, 3. *Mabillon*, Annal. Benedict. Tom i. ann. 596—607. The legendary history of *Augustine*, both in a larger and a smaller form, by *Goscelin*, a monk of the 11th century, may be found in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Tom. i. p. 485—543. Tr.]

(7) [Some rays of light had penetrated the southernmost counties of Scotland at an earlier period. *Ninia*, or *Ninian*, was bishop of Whit-hern, on the borders of Scotland, in the year 400; and his successors sometimes extended their labors as far north as Glasgow. Indeed *Kentigern* is said to have actually removed his chair from Whit-hern to Glasgow, before the arrival of *Columba*, and to have invited this Irish missionary to visit him there. It was in the year 563, that *Columba*, with 12 other monks, removed from the north of Ireland to *Iona*, *Hii*, *I*, or *I-calm-kill*, an islet on the outer shore of *Mull*, one of the larger of the Hebrides or Western isles. The Scottish king of Argyle, *Brude*, or *Bride*, favored his enterprise; and *Aidan*, a successor of *Brude*, paid him the highest reverence. *Columba* had the sole jurisdiction of his little island, which became covered with cloisters and churches, and was the residence of a numerous and learned body of monks. For several centuries *Iona* was the center of the Scottish church, and the place where most of her clergy were educated. There also the Scottish kings, for many generations, were interred. *Columba* died in the year 597. His memorable acts were recorded by *Cummeneus Albus*, (abbot of *Iona* from 657 to 669,) and may be seen in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Tom. i. p. 342 &c. and his life at large, in iii Books, was written by *Adamnanus*, who presided at *Iona* from 679 to 704. See *Usher*, Britanicar. Ecclesiar. Antiq. cap. xv. p. 687—709. Tr.]

Bavarians are said to have received christianity ;(8) which to many, however, appears extremely doubtful. Of these holy enterprises among the heathen, no one will form a high opinion, when he shall have learned from the writers of this and the following ages, that these nations still retained a great part of their former paganism, and paid only such a reverence to *Christ* as would comport with a rejection of his precepts, by their lives, their deeds, and their current usages.(9)

§ 3. A great many Jews, in various places, it is certain, made a profession of christianity. In the East, *Justinian* persuaded the Jews resident at Borium, a city of Libya, to acknowledge *Christ*.(10) In the West, many Jews yielded to the zeal and efforts of the kings of Gaul and Spain, and to those of *Gregory* the Great, and *Avitus* [bishop of Clermont]. But it should be added, that far more were induced to make an external profession of christianity, by the rewards offered by the princes, and by the fear of punishment, than by the force of arguments. In Gaul, during the reign of *Childeric*, the Jews were compelled to receive baptism : and the same thing was done in Spain.(11) But *Gregory* the Great wished this practice to be discontinued.(12)

§ 4. If credit were to be given to the writers of this age, the conversion of barbarous nations to christianity, must be ascribed principally to the prodigies and miracles that were wrought. But an inspection of the converted nations, will forbid our believing these statements ; for had these nations seen so many wonderful deeds, with their own eyes, they would have had a stronger faith

(8) Henry *Canisius*, *Lectiones Antiquae*, Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. 208. *Aventinus*, *Annal. Boiorum* ; and others

(9) As to the Franks, the Benedictine monks express themselves ingenuously ; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Tome iii. Introd. p. 8, 11, 13. As to the Anglo-Saxons, see what *Gregory* the Great himself allowed of, *Epistolar. Lib. xi. Ep. 76. Opp. Tom. ii. p. 1176. ed. Benedict.* Among other things, he permitted the people, on festival days, to offer to the saints such victims as they had before offered to their gods. *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia Magnae Britan.* Tom. i. p. 18 &c.

(10) *Procopius*, *de Aedificiis Justiniani*, Lib. vi. cap. 2.

(11) *Gregory* of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, Lib. vi. c. 18. *Jo. Launoï*, *de veteri more baptizandi Judaeos et infideles*, cap. i. in his *Opp. tom. ii. P. ii. p. 700, 704.* [All these Jewish conversions were a victory of the christians, which did them little credit. *Avitus*, for instance, the bishop of Clermont, baptized 500 Jews. But the circumstances were these : a Jew having voluntarily received baptism, was proceeding home in the customary white robe, when meeting with other Jews, one of them poured some fetid oil on his white robe. The people soon kindled into a rage, and pulled down the synagogue ; and the bishop sent word to the Jews, that they must all submit to be baptized, or must quit the place. In this dilemma, 500 preferred receiving baptism ; and the rest removed to *Marseilles*. See *Gregory* of Tours, *Hist. Francor. L. v. c. 11. Schl.*]

(12) See his *Epistles*, Lib. i. Ep. 47, in his *Opp. tom. ii. p. 541. ed. Benedict.* [or the extract from it in *Baronius*, *Annal. ad ann. 591. tom. viii. p. 26, 27. ed. Antw. 1600.* *Gregory* commends the intentions of the Gallic bishops, but thinks, that as such converts seldom persevered, and therefore exposed themselves to a heavier punishment in the other world than if they had never been baptized, charity to them required, that they should not be compelled to receive baptism. *Tr.*]

in christianity, and would have more religiously obeyed its precepts. With the major part, the example and influence of their kings, presented the chief argument for changing their religion. Nor were more solid reasons much needed ; for the first preachers of christianity among them, required of them nothing very difficult, or crossing to their inclinations ; they were only to worship the images of *Christ* and of holy men, instead of those of their gods, and for the most part with the same ceremonies ; and to commit to memory certain christian formulas. Some preachers moreover,—as might easily be proved,—deemed it lawful and right, to delude the senses of the ignorant people, and to palm on them natural events for divine interpositions.

CHAPTER II.

ADVERSE EVENTS AND OCCURRENCES.

§ 1. Pagans still remaining among the christians.—§ 2. Writers opposed to christianity.—§ 3. Persecutions and vexations.

§ 1. Although the imperial laws ordained, that no public office should be held by any one, who would not abjure paganism; yet there were many learned and respectable men, who followed the old religion, in the midst of the christians. The illustrious compiler of the Civil Law, *Tribonianus*,⁽¹⁾ is thought by some, to have been averse from the christian religion. Of *Procopius*,⁽²⁾ the celebrated and intelligent historian, the same suspicion is entertained by not a few. And it is still more certain, that *Agathias*⁽³⁾ of Smyrna, an advocate at the bar, and also a historian, was an idolater. Indeed as is commonly the case every where, the rigor of the laws fell only on those who had neither birth, nor wealth, nor the favor of the great to protect them.

§ 2. It is still more strange that the Platonists, who were universally known to be hostile to christianity, should have been al-

(1) [*Tribonianus* was a native of Side in Pamphylia, flourished about AD. 530, and died about AD. 546. Richly furnished with Greek and Roman literature, he applied himself especially to the study of law. He was advanced to various civil offices, and was in high favor with *Justinian*, on account of his eminent talents and his obsequiousness. The *Codex Justinianus* was the joint work of *Tribonianus* and others; but the compilation of the *Pandects* and *Institutes*, was committed to him as chief, with others to assist him. *Tribonianus* was avaricious and irreligious. He has been accused of atheism and paganism. The truth probably was, that he had no fixed religious principles. See *J. H. Hermann*, *Historia Juris Romani et Justiniani*, Lib. ii. c. i. § 27 &c. and *Gibbon*, *Decline and Fall*. ch. xliv. vol. iv. p. 360 &c. ed. N. York 1826. Tr.]

(2) [*Procopius* of Cesarea, (different from *Procopius* of Gaza,) was a rhetorician, senator, and historian. He was secretary to the famous general *Belisarius*, from 533 to 542, during his campaigns in Asia, Africa, and Italy; and afterwards, being made a Roman senator, resided at Constantinople, and devoted himself to writing the civil history of his own times; viz. de Bello Persico, L. ii. de Bello Vandalico, L. ii. and de Bello Gothico, L. iv. His narration is elaborate and exact, and the style not unacceptable. He also wrote de Edificiis Justiniani, L. vi. in which he displays the munificence and greatness of that emperor: likewise *Anecdota*, sive *Historia arcana*, in which he describes the vices and crimes of *Justinian*, and his Empress *Theodora*. *Procopius* was alive in the year 562. Some accuse him of leaning towards paganism. He was probably a man of no religion; but externally, a conformist to christianity. His works were published, Gr. and Lat. by *C. Maltrel*, Paris 1662, 2 vol. Fol. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.* tom. i. p. 510. Tr.]

(3) [*Agathias*, an advocate at Smyrna, continued the history of *Procopius*, from the year 553 to AD. 559, in five Books, written in an easy but florid style. He also wrote 80 epigrams. His works were published, Gr. and Lat. Paris 1660. Fol. His history and that of *Procopius*, are both in the *Corpus Historiae Byzantinae Scriptorum*. See *Lardner*, *Works*, vol. ix. p. 85. Tr.]

lowed publicly to instill their principles, which were totally inconsistent with our religion, into the minds of the youth both in Greece and Egypt. This class of men affected indeed a high degree of moderation, and for the most part, so modified their expressions as to make the pagan idolatry appear not very remote from christianity. This is evident from the examples of *Chalcidius*(4) and *Alexander* of Lycopolis.(5) Yet there were some among them, who did not hesitate openly to attack the christian religion. *Damascius*, in his life of his master *Isidore*, and elsewhere, casts many reproaches on the christians.(6) *Simplicius*, in his Expositions of Aristotle, not obscurely carps at the christian faith.(7) The *Epicheiremata xviii. contra christianos*, written by *Proclus*,(8) were in every body's hands; and therefore received a confutation from *John Philoponus*.(9) So much licence would not have been allowed to these men, had there not been among the magis-

(4) Concerning the religion of *Chalcidius*, I have spoken in my notes on *R. Cudworth's Systema Intellectuale Universi*, tom. i. p. 732. [*Chalcidius* flourished about AD. 330, and wrote his Lat. translation of *Plato's Timæus*, with a Commentary, at the suggestion (as is reported) of *Hosius* of Corduba. Some make him to have been archdeacon of Carthage. See above, Cent. iv. P. i. ch. i. § 18. with note (51) p. 271; and *Care*, Hist. Lit. tom. i. p. 199. Tr.]

(5) The treatise of this philosopher, *contra Manichæos*, in Greek, was published by *Fran. Combefis*, Auctarium Noviss. Biblioth. Patrum. tom. ii. Concerning his religion, *Is. de Beausobre* has given a critical dissertation, *Histoire de Manichée et Manichéisme*, P. ii. Discours prelim. § 13. p. 236 &c. [*Alexander*, of Lycopolis in Thebais, Egypt, flourished probably about AD. 350. *Fabrizius* supposes, (Biblioth. Gr. tom. v. p. 290,) that he was first a pagan and a Manichee, and afterwards a catholic christian. *Care* is of the same opinion (Hist. Lit. tom. ii. de Scriptor. incertae ætatis). *Beausobre* (ubi supra) thinks he was a mere pagan. *Lardner* (Works, vol. iii. p. 384, vol. viii. p. 349 &c.) thinks he was a gentile, but well acquainted with the Manichees and other christians; that he had some knowledge of the O. and N. Testaments, to which he occasionally refers. He speaks with respect of *Christ*, and the christian philosophy; and appears to have been a learned and candid man. Tr.]

(6) *Photius*, Bibliotheca, Cod. ccxlii, p. 1027. [*Damascius* was a native of Damascus, but studied and taught philosophy both at Athens and Alexandria. From the latter, he fled to Persia, during the persecution of the pagan philosophers by the emperor *Justinian*, about the year 530. His subsequent history is unknown. He wrote the lives of *Isidorus* and others, Commentaries on *Plato*, and four Books on extraordinary events: all of which are lost. *Photius* calls him εἰς ἄκρον δυσσεβὴς superlatively irreligious, (Codex clxxxi.) and gives an epitome of his life of *Isidore*, Cod. ccxlii. Tr.]

(7) [*Simplicius*, a native of Cilicia, a disciple of *Damascius*, and an eclectic philosopher; was one of those who fled into Persia, about the year 530. He returned a few years after, and wrote Commentaries on some of the philosophical and physical works of *Aristotle*: also a Commentary on the *Encheiridion* of *Epictetus*; both edited Gr. and Lat. by *H. Wolf*, Leyden 1640, 4to. Tr.]

(8) [*Proclus* was born at Constantinople AD. 410, studied at Alexandria, and at Athens, and became head of the philosophical school in the latter place, in the year 450. He died AD. 485. He was a man of much philosophical reading, a great enthusiast, a bold and whimsical speculator, and a most voluminous writer. His eighteen Arguments against the christians, are so many proofs that the world was eternal. This work, with the confutation of *John Philoponus*, was published in Greek, Venice 1535, Fol. and in Latin, Lyons 1557, Fol. Tr.]

(9) See *J. A. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. iii. p. 522 &c. [and *Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.* tom. ii. p. 491, with *Hamberger's* zuverlässigen Nachrichten, tom. iii. p. 391. Schl.]

trates many, who were christians in name and outward appearance, rather than in reality.

§ 3. The christians in some places had occasion, even in this century, to complain of the barbarity and cruelty of their enemies. During the greater part of it, the Anglo-Saxons, who had seized upon Britain, brought every kind of calamity and suffering upon the former inhabitants of the country, who were christians.(10) The *Hunns* having made an irruption into Thrace, Greece, and other provinces, during the reign of *Justinian*, treated the christians with cruelty;(11) yet they appear to have been influenced, not so much by a hatred of christianity, as by hostility to the Greek empire. A great change in the state of Italy took place, about the middle of this century, under *Justinian* I. This emperor, by *Narses* his general, overturned the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in that country, after it had stood ninety years, and annexed Italy to his empire. But under the emperor *Justin*, the Lombards, a very warlike German tribe, under their king *Alboin*, and accompanied by some other German people, broke into Italy from Pannonia, in the year 568; and having possessed themselves of the whole country, except Rome and Ravenna, founded a new kingdom at Pavia. Under new lords, who were not only barbarians, but averse from christianity, the Italian christians for a time endured immense evils and calamities. But the first rage of the conquerors gradually subsided, and the Lombards became more civilized. *Autharis*, their third king, made a profession of christianity, in the year 587; but he embraced the Arian creed. His successor, however, *Agilulph*, was induced by his queen, *Theodelinda*, to abandon the Arian sect, and join the catholics of the Nicene creed.(12) *Chosroes*, the king of Persia, exceeded all others in barbarity; for he publicly declared, that he would make war, not upon *Justinian*, but upon the God of the christians; and he cut off an immense number of christians by various modes of execution.(13)

(10) *Ja. Usher*, Index Chronolog. Antiq. Eccles. Britan. ad ann. 508, p. 1123 [and still more to the purpose, ad ann. 511, p. 1125, and ad ann. 597, p. 1151 &c. At the beginning of this century, the Saxons held only Kent and Sussex, embracing about three counties in the south east part of England; all the rest of the country was inhabited by christian Britons. But during this century, the Saxons gradually extended their conquests; and before the century closed, the Britons were shut up among the mountains of Wales and Cornwall, except a few in Cumberland on the borders of Scotland, or were driven to take refuge beyond seas. Over all the rest of England paganism reigned: the churches were demolished, or converted into idolatrous temples, and the public worship of the true God had ceased. *Tr.*]

(11) *Procopius*, de Bello Persico, Lib. ii. c. 4.

(12) *Paulus Diaconus*, de gestis Longobardorum, L. ii. c. 2. and c. 27, p. 219, 231. ed. Lindenbrog. *Muratori*, Antiq. Italiae, Tom. i. p. 14. Tom. ii. p. 297 &c. and Annales Italici. *Giannone*, Histoire de Naples, Tom. i. p. 302 &c.

(13) *Procopius*, de Bello Persico, L. ii. c. 26.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. The state of learning in the West.—§ 2. The sciences badly taught.—§ 3. The study of philosophy.—§ 4. State of learning among the Greeks—§ 5. and in the East.

§ 1. Every one knows, that the irruption of the fierce and barbarous nations into most of the provinces of the West, was extremely prejudicial to literature, and to every species of learning. All the liberal arts and sciences would have become wholly extinct, had they not found some sort of refuge among the bishops and monks. To most of those churches which are called *cathe-drals*, schools were annexed, in which either the bishop himself, or some one appointed by him, instructed the youth in the seven liberal arts, as a preparation for the study of the sacred books.(1) The monks and nuns were nearly all required, by the founders of their houses, to devote some portion of every day to the reading of the works of the ancient fathers of the church, who were supposed to have exhausted the fountains of sacred knowledge.(2) It was therefore necessary that libraries should be formed in the monasteries, and that books should be multiplied by being transcribed. This labor of transcribing books was generally assigned to the more feeble bodied monks, who were unable to encounter severe labor. To these establishments, we owe the preservation of all the ancient authors that have come down to us, both sacred and profane. Moreover, in most of the monasteries, schools were opened, in which the abbot or some one of the monks instructed the children and youth that were devoted to a monastic life.(3)

(1) *Claude Fleury*, Discours sur l' Histoire ecclesiastique depuis l' an. 600 &c. § xxi &c. in his *Histoire Eccles.* Tome xiii. p. 56. *Histoire litteraire de la France*, Tome iii. Introd. § xxxii. p. 12 &c. *Herm. Conringius*, *Antiquit. Academicæ*, p. 66—167. ed. Heumann. [*Gregory of Tours*, Lib. vi. c. 36. *Schl.*]

(2) *Benedict of Anian*, *Concordia Regularium*, Lib. ii. p. 55, 64, 75, 77, 80, 100. Lib. iii. p. 16—41 &c. ed. *Hug. Menard.* *Jo. Mabillon*, *Praef. ad Saecul. i. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* p. xliv &c.

(3) *Benedict*, *Concordia Regular.* Lib. ii. p. 232. *Joh. Mabillon*, *Acta Sano-*

§ 2. But, not to mention that many of the bishops and others, who had control over the monks, were inattentive to their duty ; and that others had strong prejudices against learning and science, which they apprehended to be hazardous to piety,—a fault commonly attributed to *Gregory* the Great, bishop of Rome, who, it is said, wished to have many of the ancient authors committed to the flames ;(4)—not to mention also, that some of the bishops, of set purpose, cultivated ignorance and barbarism, which they confounded with christian simplicity ; to pass over these considerations, it remains to be stated, that the branches of learning taught in these schools, were confined within very narrow limits ;(5) and that the teachers were ignorant and incompetent. Greek literature was almost every where neglected : and those who professed to cultivate Latin, consumed their time on grammatical subtilties and niceties ; as is manifest from the examples of *Isidorus* and *Cassiodorus*. Eloquence had degenerated into a rhetorical parade, which was sustained by motly and frigid figures, and barbarous phraseology ; as is shown by those who composed with most elegance, such as *Boethius*, *Cassiodorus*, *Ennodius*, and others. The other liberal arts, as they were called, contained nothing elevated and liberal ; but consisted of only a few precepts, and those very dry.

tor. Ord. Benedict. Tom. i. p. 314 &c. [And yet it is certain, that these monkish schools kept aloof from the sources of real learning, I mean the ancient classic authors ; and that the best interpreters of scripture among the fathers, such as *Origen* and *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, were left to moulder in the dust. On the contrary, the young monks were occupied with reading and transcribing the most silly fables and legends, by which their understandings and their imaginations were injured past recovery. In the Rule of *Isidore*, it is expressly stated : *Libros gentilium, haereticorum, legere nefas. Schl.*]

(4) *Gabr. Liron*, Singularités historiques et litter. Tome i. p. 166 &c. [That *Gregory* was opposed to all secular learning, appears incontrovertably from his conduct towards *Desiderius*, bishop of Vienne. This bishop was a man of great merit, virtues, and learning. But he instructed some of his friends in grammar and the fine arts, and read with them the pagan poets. *Gregory* looked upon all this as horrible wickedness ; and therefore hesitated about sending him the pall ; and reprov'd him very sharply, in an epistle which is still extant. (*Gregory*, Epist. Lib. ix. Ep. 48.) “Because (says the honest pope, who esteemed it no wrong, to praise extravagantly the greatest villains and the cruellest murderers,) the praises of *Christ* and those of *Jupiter* cannot have place in the same mouth. And consider, how enormous a crime it is, for a bishop to *sing* ! which would be unbecoming even in a religious layman. The more horrible this is in a priest, the more earnestly and faithfully should it be inquired into.—If it should hereafter appear clearly, that the reports which have reached me are false, and that you do not study vanities and secular literature (*nec vos nugis et secularibus literis studere*) ; I shall praise God, who has not permitted your heart to be defiled with the blasphemous praises of the horrible ones.”—But whether it be true, as *John* of Salisbury states, (*de Nugis Curialium*, Lib. ii. c. 26. and Lib. viii. c. 19.) that he caused the Palatine or Capitoline library to be burned ; or as *Antoninus* of Florence tells us, (see *Vossius*, *de Historicis Latinis*, p. 98.) that he committed to the flames *Livy's* History ; must be considered uncertain, as the witnesses are so modern. Yet it would not be improbable, in a man of such flaming zeal against the pagan writers. *Schl.*]

(5) See *M. Andr. Cassiodorus*, *de septem Disciplinis Liber* ; among his *Works*.

§ 3. Philosophy was wholly excluded from the schools, which were under the direction of the clergy ; for nearly all supposed, that religious persons could do very well without it, or rather ought never to meddle with it. The most eminent, and indeed almost the only Latin philosopher of this age, was the celebrated *Boethius*, privy counsellor to *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths in Italy. He embraced the *Platonic* system ;(6) but, like most of the younger Platonists, approved also the precepts of *Aristotle*, and illustrated them by his writings. He is therefore not improperly regarded as the man, whose labors brought the Aristotelian philosophy into higher repute, among the Latins, than it had before been.

§ 4. Among the Greeks, the liberal arts were cultivated with more zeal, in several places ; and some of the emperors encouraged with honors and rewards every branch of learning :(7) yet the number of the men of genius appears much smaller, than in the preceding century. When this century commenced, the younger *Platonism* was flourishing in full splendor. The schools of Alexandria and Athens were under masters of high credit, *Damascius*, *Isidore*,(8) *Simplicius*, *Eulamius*, *Hermias*, *Priscian*, and others. But when the emperor *Justinian*, by an express law, forbid the teaching of philosophy at Athens,(9) (which is undoubtedly to be understood of this species of philosophy,) and manifested peculiar displeasure against those who would not renounce idolatry, all these philosophers took up their residence among the Persians, the enemies of the Romans.(10) They returned again, indeed, in the year 533, on the restoration of peace between the Persians and the Romans ;(11) but they were

(6) This will be evident to any one who, with some knowledge of the views of the younger Platonists, takes up his *Books de Consolatione philosophiae*. See also *Renat. Vallinus*, Notes, p. 10, 50. *Luc. Holstenius*, de Vita Porphyrii, p. 7. ed. Cantabr. likewise, *Jo. Jas. Mascor*, *Historia Germanorum*, Tom. ii. p. 102 &c. [*Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.* Tom. iii. p. 524 &c. and *Hamberger's* zuverlässige Nachrichten, vol. iii. p. 317 &c. Schl.]

(7) See the *Codex Theodos.* Tom. ii. Lib. vi. p. 113 &c. *Herm. Conringius*, de Studiis urbis Romae et Constantinop. annexed to his *Diss. de Antiquit. Academicis*.

(8) [See *Brucker's* account of *Isidore*, in his *Historia crit. Philos.* Tom. ii. p. 341. *Isidore*, was called *Gazaëus*, from his native place, Gaza in Palestine ; and this discriminated him from *Isidore Mercator*, Hispalensis, and Pelusiota. Schl.]

(9) *Johannes Malala*, *Historia Chronica*, P. ii. p. 187. ed. Oxon. Another testimony to the same point, derived from, I know not what, unpublished *Chronicon*, is adduced by *Nicol. Alemannus*, ad *Procopii Historiam arcanam*, cap. 26. p. 377. ed. Venetae. [Also *Agathias*, cap. 2. and *Suidas*, Article $\epsilon\pi\sigma\beta\omicron\varsigma$, Tom. iii. p. 171, seem to refer to this event, by saying : *Damascius*, *Simplicius*, *Eulalius*, *Priscianus*, *Hermias*, *Diogenes* and *Isidorus*, retired to Persia, because they could not live according to their inclinations. Schl.]

(10) *Agathias*, de Rebus Justiniani, L. ii. *Corpus Byzant.* Tom. iii. p. 49. ed. Venetae.

(11) Consult the excellent *Peter Wesselingius*, *Observat. variar.* Lib. i. c. 18. p. 117.

never able to recover their former credit, and they gradually ceased to keep up their schools. Such was the termination of this sect, which had been a most troublesome one to the church for many centuries. On the contrary, the *Aristotelian* philosophy gradually emerged from its obscurity, and received explanations, particularly from the commentaries of *John Philoponus*. And it became necessary for the Greeks to acquaint themselves with it, because the *Monophysites* and the *Nestorians* endeavored to confute the adherents to the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, by arguments suggested by this philosophy.

§ 5. For the *Nestorians* as well as the *Monophysites*, who lived in the East, kept *Aristotle* in their eye; and to enable their adherents to be good disputants, translated his principal works out of Greek into their vernacular tongues. In the Syriac language, *Sergius Rasainensis*, a Monophysite and a philosopher, exhibited the writings of Aristotle.(12) In Persia, one *Uranius*, a Syrian, propagated his doctrines; and even instilled them into the mind of *Chosroes*, the king, who was studious of such matters.(13) Another, who was doubtless of the Nestorian sect, (for no other in this age prevailed in Persia, the Greeks being excluded,) presented the king with a Persian translation of *Aristotle*.(14) Yet there were among these christians, some who, rejecting both *Plato* and *Aristotle*, chose to philosophize or speculate according as their own genius led them. Such was the Nestorian *Cosmas*, called *Indicopleustes*; whose opinions were quite peculiar, and more consentaneous with those of the orientals, than with those of the Greeks.(15) Such also was the writer, from whose Exposition of the Octateuch, *Photius* has preserved some extracts.(16)

(12) *Georgius Abulpharajus*, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 94, 172, ed. of *Pacock*.

(13) *Agathias*, de Rebus Justiniani, Lib. ii. p. 48. That this *Uranius* accommodated the precepts of *Aristotle* to the Eutychian controversies, appears from this, that *Agathias* represents him as disputing about the *possibility* and *immiscibility* of God, καὶ τὸ παθεῖν καὶ ἀζύγιστον. [*Uranius* was in so high esteem with king *Chosroes*, that he had him constantly at his table. He wished to be accounted a sceptic; but may more justly be ranked among the Nestorians, than among the proper philosophers. *Schl.*]

(14) *Agathias*, de Rebus Justiniani, Lib. ii. p. 48. ed. Venetae.

(15) *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, Praef. ad *Cosmas*, p. x &c. in his *Collectio Nov. Patr. Graecorum*. [This *Cosmas* was an Egyptian monk. In early life he was a merchant, and drove a traffic through the whole length of the Red sea, and quite to India: whence he got the name of *Indicopleustes*, an *India Navigator*. After many years spent in this manner, he took up residence in a monastery in Egypt, and devoted himself to composing books. His chief work is *Topographia Christiana, sive Christianorum opinio de mundo*, in xii Books. It is his great aim to prove the earth not spherical, but a vast oblong plain; the length, east and west, being double the breadth. He argues from scripture, reason, testimony, and the authority of the fathers. But while pressing his main point, he introduces much valuable geographical information, which he had collected in his voyages. He flourished, and probably wrote, about AD. 535. The best edition, is that of *Montfaucon*, Gr. and Lat. in *Collect. Nov. Patr. Gr.* tom. ii. Paris 1706. See *Cave's Historia Litteraria*, Tom. i. p. 515 &c. *Tr.*]

(16) *Photius*, *Biblioth. Cod.* xxxvi. p. 22, 23.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Contests between the bishops of Constantinople and Rome.—§ 2. Endeavors of the latter to obtain supreme power.—§ 3, 4. Corrupt lives of the clergy.—§ 5. The monks.—§ 6. Order of Benedict.—§ 7. Its propagation.—§ 8. Principal authors among the Greeks.—§ 9. Latin writers.

§ 1. In the constitution of the christian church, there was no important change. But the two prelates, who considered themselves, and were regarded by others, as standing at the head of the whole church, the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, were incessantly contending for priority, and about the extent of their territories and jurisdiction. The bishop of Constantinople not only claimed the primacy in the eastern churches, but maintained that his see was in no respect inferior to that of Rome. But the pontiffs of Rome were exceedingly disturbed at this, and contended that *their* see held a rank and preeminence above that of Constantinople. In particular, the Roman pontiff, *Gregory* the Great, did so, in the year 587; when *John* of Constantinople, surnamed the *Faster*, on account of the austerity of his life, had by his own authority assembled a council of eastern bishops at Constantinople, to decide on charges brought against *Peter* [*Gregory*] bishop of Antioch; and on this occasion had arrogated to himself the title of *oecumenical* or *universal bishop*.⁽¹⁾ For,

(1) [*Dr. Mosheim* here confounds dates, names, and transactions. *Gregory*, (not *Peter*,) bishop of Antioch, being accused of incest and other crimes, appealed from the tribunal of the governor of the East, to the emperor *Mauricius*: and the emperor, (not the patriarch *John*,) called a council, or appointed a court of Commissioners at Constantinople, in 587, composed of patriarchs, (or their delegates,) Roman senators, and metropolitans, to hear and decide the case. (See *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. L. vi. c. 7. *Evagrius* was *Peter's* counsellor at the trial, and has given us nearly all the information which has reached us respecting this council.) On this occasion, it is said, *John*, the patriarch of Constantinople, was honored with the title of *universal bishop*,—a title which had for some time been used by the bishops of that see. The decisions of this council being sent to *Pelagius* II. (not to *Gregory* the Great,) bishop of Rome, *Pelagius* confirmed the acquittal of *Peter*, but remonstrated strongly against the title given to *John*. His letters on the occasion are lost, but they are mentioned by his successor. In the year 590, *Pelagius* died, and was succeeded by *Gregory* the Great; and he, finding that *John* continued to use this title, took up the business in earnest, about the year 595, and for some years labored by intreaties and threats, and continued applications to the emperors and to the other eastern patriarchs, to divest the Constantinopolitan patriarchs, of a title which he maintained to be *profane*, *anti-christian*, and *infernal*, by whomsoever assumed. See *Gregory* the Great, Epistolar. Lib. iv. Ep. 36, 38. and Lib. vi. Ep. 39 &c. *Bower's* Lives of the Popes (*Pelagius* II.) vol. ii. p. 459. and (*Gregory*) vol. ii. p. 505, 511, 517. ed. Lond. 1750. *Natalis Alexander*, Hist. Eccles. Saecul. vi. cap. ii. art. 12, 13, Tom. x. p. 18, 25 &c. ed. Paris 1743. Tr.]

although the bishops of Constantinople had long used this title, which was capable of a harmless interpretation ; yet *Gregory* concluded, from the time and the occasion on which it was now used, that *John* was aiming at a supremacy over all christian churches ; and he therefore wrote letters to the emperor, and to others, in which he vehemently inveighed against this title. But he could effect nothing : and the bishops of Constantinople continued to assume it, though not in the sense which *Gregory* supposed.(2)

§ 2. The bishop of Rome persevering in his opposition, excited commotion every where, in order to bring the christian world under his own control. And he was in some degree successful, especially in the West ; but in the East, scarcely any would listen to him, unless actuated by hostility to the bishop of Constantinople ; and this last was always in a condition to oppose his ambitious designs in that quarter. How greatly the ideas of many had advanced respecting the powers of the bishop of Rome, cannot better be shown than by the example of *Ennodius*, the insane flatterer of *Symmachus* ; who, among other extravagant expressions, said, *the pontiff judges in the place of God*, vice Dei judicare.(3) But on the other hand, there are numerous proofs, that the emperors, as well as some whole nations, would not patiently bear this new yoke.(4) The Gothic kings in Italy would not allow the bishop of Rome, to domineer excessively there ; nor would they allow any one to be considered as pontiff, whom they had not approved ; and they wished to have his election controlled by their decisions.(5) These kings also enacted laws relative to religious matters, arraigned the clergy before their tribunals, and summoned ecclesiastical councils.(6) And the pontiffs themselves paid homage to these sovereigns, and afterwards to the emperors, in a submissive manner ; for they had

(2) *Gregory* the Great, Epistolar. Lib. iv. v. vi. All the passages in these Epistles, relating to this important subject, are collected and illustrated by *Jo. Launoy*, Assertio in privilegium S. Medardi, Opp. Tom. iii. P. ii. p. 266 &c. See *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, Tom. i. p. 67 &c. *Chr. Matth. Pfaff*, Diss. de titulo Oecumenicus ; in the Tempe Helvetica, Tom. iv. p. 99. and the authors there mentioned.

(3) See his Apologeticum pro Synodo, in the Biblioth. mag. Patr. Tom. xv. p. 248. ed. Paris.

(4) See, particularly respecting Spain, *Mich. Geddes*, On the Papal supremacy, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spanish church ; published among his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii. p. 1 &c.

(5) See *Joh. Ja. Mascov*, Historia Germanorum, Tom. ii. Note, p. 113.

(6) *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, Tom. i. p. 381 &c. [Thus, e. g. *Theodoric* assembled the Italian bishops at Rome, to settle the contested election of *Symmachus* to the papal chair. (*Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 347.) The council of Orleans, in 511, was held by order of *Clovis*. (Ibid. p. 351.) Another at Orleans, in 533, by order of *Childebert*, (Ibid. p. 367.) And in the year 549. (Ibid. p. 375.) And at Clermont, by order of *Theudebert*, (Ibid. p. 368.) *Schl.*]

not yet become so lost to all shame, as to look upon temporal sovereigns as their vassals.(7)

§ 3. The clergy were previously in possession of high privileges, and great wealth, and the superstition of this century added considerably to both. For it was supposed, that sins might be expiated, by munificence to churches and to monks; and that the prayers of departed saints, which were most efficacious with God, might be purchased, by presents offered to them, and by temples dedicated to their names.(8) This increase of wealth and privileges, was accompanied with an equal increase of the vices usually attendant on affluence, in the clergy of all ranks, from the highest to the lowest;(9) as is manifest even from the laws enacted by councils and by the emperors to regulate the lives and morals of the clergy.(10) For what need was there of guarding the morals of these men with such ramparts of laws, if they manifested only a moderate love for virtue and piety? Yet the efficacy of these laws was slight; for so great was the reverence for the clergy, that their most atrocious offences were visited with the gentlest chastisements; and this emboldened them to perpetrate any iniquity.

§ 4. What sort of men the bishops of Rome were, who wished to be thought the chiefs and fathers of the whole christian church, and also the body of the clergy under them at Rome, best appears from the long and violent contest between *Symmachus* and *Laurentius*; which broke out in the year 498, and was at length

(7) See the collections from *Gregory* the Great, by *Jo. Launoy*, de Regia potestate in matrimon. Opp. Tom. i. Pt. ii. p. 691 &c. and Assertio in privilegium S. Medardi, Opp. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. 275. *Giannone*, Histoire de Naples, Tom. ii. p. 282 &c.

(8) [Thus e. g. *Gregory* (in cap. xv. Jobi, L. xii. c. 23.) says: "Whenever, after committing a crime, we give alms, we do as it were compensate for our wicked actions." So also, in his Epistles (Lib. ix. Ep. 38.) "The intercessions in heaven of him, whose body you have covered on earth, will protect you from all sins," &c. *Schl.*]

(9) [*Theophanes*, (on the second year of *Justinian's* reign,) states that *Esaias* bishop of Rhodes, and *Alexander* bishop of Diospolis in Thrace, were for the crime of sodomy deprived of their offices, and castrated, by order of the emperor; and then carried about as a show, with a herald proclaiming: "All ye bishops, beware of disgracing your venerable office." So in the epistles of *Gregory* the Great, many proofs occur of impure conduct among the clergy: e. g. L. viii. Ep. 11. L. iii. Ep. 26. and 9. L. i. Ep. 18, 42. *Schl.*]

(10) [Thus, e. g. in the council of Agde in Gaul, (can. 41.) it was enacted, that a clergyman who should get drunk, should be excluded the church for 30 days, or undergo corporeal punishment: and, (can. 42,) the clergy were forbidden to exercise the art of fortune-telling. *Harduin's* Concilia, Tom. ii. p. 1002. Other laws forbid simony, concubinage, perjury, usury, and gaudy dress, in the clergy. In *Harduin's* Concilia, Tom. iii. p. 529, mention is made of many nuns, at the head of whom were two princesses, *Chrotildis* and *Basine*, who broke from the nunnery at Poitiers, and who were a part of them found pregnant, and also committed the most shameful acts of violence. And in page 531, he mentions one *Aegidius*, bishop of Rheims, who used forged documents before the council of Metz; and, for treasonable practices, was removed from office. See *Fleury*, Ecclesiast. History; the German translation, vol. v. p. 413, 417. *Schl.*]

settled by the Gothic king *Theodoric*. Each maintained, that himself was the regularly constituted pontiff; and each accused the other of the most abominable crimes, and not without an appearance of truth. Three councils assembled at Rome, were not able to terminate the dreadful quarrel: in the fourth, *Theodoric* having taken up the business, soon after the commencement of the century, *Symmachus* was at length pronounced innocent. But the adverse party continued to deny, that justice had been done *them*, by this decision; and this led *Ennodius* of Pavia to write his *Apology for the council and for Symmachus*.⁽¹¹⁾ From this treatise, which abounds in rhetorical coloring, we may clearly learn, that the foundation of that exorbitant power which the pontiffs afterwards obtained, were already laid; but not, that *Symmachus* had been inconsiderately and unjustly accused.

§ 5. The progress of monkery was very great, both in the East and in the West. In the East, whole armies of monks might have been enrolled, without any sensible diminution of the number any where. In the West, this mode of life found patrons and followers, almost without number, in all the provinces: as

(11) This Apology is extant in the Biblioth. Magn. Patr. Tom. xv. p. 248 &c. [and in most of the Collections of Councils.—This contest may be worth describing more fully.—On the death of the pontiff *Athanasius*, in the year 498, not only the clergy, but the people and the senate of Rome, were divided about a successor. *Symmachus* a deacon, and *Laurentius* the archpresbyter, were both chosen on the same day, by their respective partizans: and so eager were both parties to carry their point, that the whole city was in an uproar, and many battles and much bloodshed took place in the streets and in the public places. To end the dire contest, the leading men on both sides agreed to refer the contested point to the decision of *Theodoric*, the Arian king resident at Ravenna. He decided, that the one who should be found to have had most votes, and to have been elected at the earliest hour, should be considered the legal pontiff. This secured the election of *Symmachus*. The king likewise ordered the bishops to make regulations for the election of future popes, which should prevent the recurrence of similar difficulties. This was done in the year 499. But the party of *Laurentius* were not yet quiet. In the year 500, they accused *Symmachus* of several heinous crimes before the king; and the tumults and civil wars of Rome were renewed, with increased violence. Some senators informed the king of the state of Rome, and requested him to send a Visitor to Rome, with full power to settle all the difficulties. *Peter*, bishop of Altino, was appointed. He repaired to Rome, and at once suspended *Symmachus*, and took the goods of the church into his own hands. This enraged the partizans of *Symmachus*, to madness, and prostrated all order and subordination. Being apprized of the state of things, the king now repaired to Rome in person, and spent six months in tranquilizing that distracted city. He ordered all the bishops of Italy to meet in council, and decide on the charges against *Symmachus*. The council held several meetings in that and the following years. *Symmachus*, when sent for, set out to go to the council, attended by a mob: a battle ensued, in the streets; several were killed; *Symmachus* himself was wounded, turned back, and refused to appear before the council. The council, after some delay, proceeded in his absence; decreed that the witnesses, being slaves, were incompetent to prove any thing; and therefore dismissed the complaint. The friends of *Laurentius* protested against the decision. The council met again, and adopted as their own, the apology for them drawn up by *Ennodius*. See *Bower's Lives of the Popes* (*Symmachus*) vol. ii. p. 248—261. ed. Lond. 1750. *Harduin*, Concilia, Tom. ii. p. 961 &c. 975, 983, 989. Tr.]

may appear from the various rules, drawn up by different individuals, for regulating the lives of monks and nuns.(12) In Great Britain, one *Congal* is said to have persuaded an immense number, to abandon active life and spend their days in solitude, according to a rule which he prescribed.(13) His disciples filled Ireland, Gaul, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries, with convents of monks. The most famous of them was *Columbanus*, who has left us a rule of his own, distinguished for its simplicity and brevity.(14) The whole monastic order abounded with fanatics and profligates. In the oriental monasteries, there were more fanatics than knaves.

§ 6. A new order of monks, which in time absorbed all the others in the West, was established at mount *Cassino*, in the year 529, by *Benedict* of Nursia, a devout and a distinguished man, according to the standard of that age. His *Rule* is still extant; and it shows, that it was not his aim to bring all monks under his regulations; but rather to found a new society, more stable, of better morals, and living under milder rules, than the other monks; the members of which should lead a retired and holy life, employed in prayers, reading, manual labor, and the instruction of youth.(15) But his followers departed widely from the princi-

(12) Most of these Rules are extant, in *Lu. Holstein's Codex Regularum*, Pt. ii. published at Rome 1661. in 3 vol. 4to. Add *Edm. Martene and Ursin. Durand, Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, Tom. i. p. 4.

(13) *Ja. Usher*, Antiq. Eccles. Britan. p. 132, 441, 911. [*Comgallus*, or *Con-gellus*, was an Irish monk, who founded several monasteries; the most important of which was that of *Banchor*, or *Bangor*, (on the south shore of *Carrickfergus* bay, in the northeasterly part of Ireland,) erected about AD. 530. *Congal* is said to have ruled over 3000 monks, living in different monasteries and cells. See *Usher*, loc. cit. Tr.]

(14) *Ja. Usher*, Sylloge antiquar. Epistolar. Hibernicarum, p. 5—15. *Lu Holstein*, Codex Regular. Tom. ii. p. 48 &c. *Mabillon*, Praef. ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Saecul. ii. p. iv. [*St. Columbanus*, (a different person from *Columbas*, the apostle of Scotland, mentioned, pa. 451 supra,) was born in *Leinster*, Ireland, about the year 559. After a good education in the literature of that age, he became a monk, in the monastery of *Bangor*, under *Congal*. In the year 589, with 12 companions, he passed through England into Gaul; and settled in *Burgundy*, where he built the monastery of *Luxeul*, or *Luxovium*; and there spent about 20 years, with great reputation. But in the year 610, having offended *Theodorick* the king, by reproving his vices, he was banished that territory; and after wandering a few years in different parts of Gaul and Germany along the Rhine, and spending three years near *Bregentz*, in *Helvetia*, he went into Italy; was received kindly, by *Agilulph* the Lombard king, built the monastery of *Bobio* near *Pavia*, presided over it one year, and then died, about AD. 615. He was a man of superior genius, and possessed vast influence. His works, yet remaining, are his monastic rule; his monastic discipline; some poems and epistles; and 17 discourses; which were published at *Louvain* in 1667, by *Patric Fleming*, an Irish monk. His life, written by *Jonas*, an abbot of *Bobium*, while several contemporaries of *Columbanus* were yet living, is extant in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Tom. ii. p. 2—26. Tr.]

(15) See *Jo. Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Tom. i. and *Annales Ord. Benedict.* Tom. i. *Helyot* [*Histoire des Ordres monastiques religieux et militaires &c.* in 8 vol. 4to. Paris, 1714—19.] and the other historians of the monastic orders.—[*Benedict* was born of reputable parents, at *Nursia* in Italy, AD. 480. At the age of 14, he was sent to Rome for education; but, disgusted with the

ples of their founder ; for, after they had acquired immense riches, from the liberality of princes and pious individuals, they gav

dissipations of the city and the school, he soon ran away, and concealed himself three years in a cave, at *Sublacum* about 40 miles from Rome. At length he was discovered, and his cell became much frequented. He was now chosen abbot of a monastery in the vicinity ; but the rigor of his discipline gave offence, and he relinquished the office, and returned to *Sublacum*, where he continued till about the year 529. Many monks here joined him, and he had 12 cells, each containing 12 monks, under *his* jurisdiction. Many of the first Roman families placed their sons under his instruction ; and his reputation for piety and for miracles procured him almost unbounded respect. But his fame excited the envy of some clergymen, and led to plots against his life. After 25 years spent at *Sublacum*, he retired to mount *Cassino*, about 50 miles south of *Sublacum*, and about as far from Naples. Here he converted a body of pagan mountaineers, and turned their temple into a monastery, in which he spent the remainder of his days in quietude and honor. He died about AD. 543. His life was written by pope *Gregory* the Great, and constitutes the second Book of his *Dialogue* : it is also inserted in *Mabillon's Acta Sanctor. Ord. Ben. Tom. i. p. 1—25.*—According to the *Rule* of *Benedict*, the monks were to rise at 2 A. M. in winter, (and in summer, at such hours as the abbot might direct,) repair to the place of worship, for vigils ; and then spend the remainder of the night in committing psalms, private meditation, and reading. At sun rise, they assembled for matins ; then spent four hours in labor ; then two hours in reading ; then dined, and read in private till half past two P. M. when they met again for worship ; and afterwards labored till their vespers. In their vigils and matins, 24 Psalms were to be chanted each day ; so as to complete the Psalter, every week. Besides their social worship, seven hours each day were devoted to labor, two at least to private study, one to private meditation, and the rest to meals, sleep, and refreshment. The labor was agriculture, gardening, and various mechanical trades ; and each one was put to such labor as his superior saw fit ; for they all renounced wholly every species of personal liberty. They ate twice a day, at a common table ; first, about noon, and then at evening. Both the quantity and the quality of their food were limited. To each was allowed one pound of bread per day, and a small quantity of wine. On the public table, no meat was allowed, but always two kinds of porridge. To the sick, flesh was allowed. While at table all conversation was prohibited ; and some one read aloud the whole time. They all served as cooks and waiters, by turns, of a week each. Their clothing was coarse and simple, and regulated at the discretion of the abbot. Each was provided with two suits, a knife, a needle, and all other necessities. They slept in common dormitories of 10 or 20, in separate beds, without undressing, and had a light burning, and an inspector sleeping in each dormitory. They were allowed no conversation, after they retired ; nor at any time were they permitted to jest, or to talk for mere amusement. No one could receive a present of any kind, not even from a parent ; nor have any correspondence with persons without the monastery, except by its passing under the inspection of the abbot. A porter always sat at the gate, which was kept locked day and night ; and no stranger was admitted without leave from the abbot ; and no monk could go out, unless he had permission from the same source. The school for the children of the neighborhood, was kept without the walls. The whole establishment was under an abbot, whose power was despotic. His under officers, were a prior or deputy, a steward, a superintendent of the sick and the hospital, an attendant on visitors, a porter, &c. with the necessary assistants, and a number of deans, or inspectors over tens, who attended the monks at all times. The abbot was elected by the common suffrage of the brotherhood ; and when inaugurated, he appointed and removed his under officers at pleasure. On great emergencies, he summoned the whole brotherhood to meet in council ; and on more common occasions, only the seniors ; but in either case, after hearing what each one was pleased to say, the decision rested wholly with himself. For admission to the society, a probation of 12 months was required ; during which the applicant was fed and clothed, and employed in the meaner offices of the monks, and closely watched. At the end of his probation, if approved, he took solemn and irrevocable vows of perfect chastity, absolute poverty, and implicit obedience to his superiors, in every thing. If he had

themselves up to luxury, idleness, and every vice ; became involved in civil affairs and the cabals of courts ; were intent on multiplying vain and superstitious rites, and most eager to advance the authority and power of the Roman pontiffs. None of these things were enjoined or permitted by *St. Benedict* ; whose Rule, though still highly extolled, has for many ages ceased to be observed.(16) Yet the institution of *Benedict* changed the state of monkery in the West, in various respects ; not the least important of which was, that the *application*, and *profession*, made by the monks, bound them *forever* to observe his rules : whereas previously, the monks changed the rule and regulations of their founders at pleasure.(17)

property, he must give it all away, either to his friends or the poor, or the monastery ; and never after must possess the least particle of private property, nor claim any personal rights or liberties. For lighter offences, a reprimand was to be administered by some under officer. For greater offences, after two admonitions, a person was debarred his privileges, not allowed to read in his turn, or to sit at table, or enjoy his modicum of comforts. If still refractory, he was expelled the monastery ; yet might be restored on repentance. See the *Rule*, at large, in *Hospinian*, Opp. Tom. iv. (de Monachis Libri vii.) p. 202—222. ed. Genev. 1669, Fol. and as abridged by *Fleury*, *Histoire Eccles. Lib. xxxii. § 14—19*. Yet it is questionable whether the Rule as there laid down, was precisely what *Benedict* prescribed. Tr.]

(16) [The modern Benedictines are themselves obliged to admit, that the Rule of their founder is no longer fully obeyed. But they resort to a convenient distinction. The Rule, say they, has its *essential*, and its *accidental* parts. That the monks should labor, earn their own bread, and live frugally, belongs to the accidental part. The essential parts are the *vows* ; which we observe religiously, a few faults excepted. We admit freely, that the order is richer, than in the days of its founder. Father *Benedict* would be amazed, should he rise out of his grave, and instead of the miserable huts which he erected on mount Cassino, find there a palace, in which kings and princes might reside ; and see the abbot transformed into a prince of the empire, with a multitude of subjects, and an income of five or six hundred thousand ducats. *Schl.* On the present state of this monastery, see *Staüdlin's kirchliche Geographie*, vol. i. p. 565. Tr.]

(17) See *Mabillon*, Praef. ad Saecul. iv. P. i. (Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Tom. v.) p. xviii &c. [*Benedict* changed the state of monkery, especially, by restraining the instability of the monks, and rendering their vows irrevocable. It was not strange that the order spread far and wide. His *Rule* was better calculated for Europeans, than any other ; and the first Benedictines were virtuous, upright, and useful people. Wherever they came, they converted the wilderness into a cultivated country : they pursued the breeding of cattle, and agriculture, labored with their own hands, drained morasses, and cleared away forests. These monks,—taking the word *Benedictines* in its largest extent, as embracing the ramifications of the order, the Carthusians, Cisterians, Praemonstratensians, Camaldulensians, &c.—were of great advantage to all Europe, and particularly to Germany. By them Germany was cultivated and rendered a fruitful country. They preserved for us all the books of antiquity, all the sciences and learning of the ancients. For they were obliged to have libraries in their monasteries ; because their rule required them to read, a portion of each day. Some individuals were occupied in transcribing the books of the ancients ; and hence came the manuscripts, which still exist here and there in the libraries of monasteries. The sciences were cultivated no where, but in their cloisters. They kept up schools there, for the monks, and for such as were destined to be monks. And without their cloisters they also had schools, in which the people of the world were instructed. From these monasteries proceeded men of learning, who were employed in courts, as chancellors, vicechancellors, secretaries &c. and these again patronized the monasteries. Even the children of sovereign princes were brought

§ 7. Only a short time elapsed, before this new order of monks was in a most flourishing state in all the western countries. In Gaul, it was propagated by *St. Maurus*; in Sicily and Sardinia, by *Placidus* and others; in England, by *Augustine* and *Mellitus*; in Italy, and in other parts, by *Gregory* the Great, who is reported to have lived some time in this order.(18) In Germany, *Boniface* afterwards caused it to be received.(19) This rapid progress of their order, the Benedictines ascribe to the miracles of *St. Benedict* and his disciples, and to the holiness and superiority of the rules which he prescribed. But those who more critically examine the causes of events, have very nearly all united in the opinion, that the favor shewn them by the Roman pontiffs, to whose glory and exaltation this whole order was especially devoted, contributed more than all other causes to its wide extension and grandeur. Yet it was not till the ninth century, that all other rules and societies became extinct, and the Benedictines alone reigned.(20)

§ 8. Among the Greek and oriental christians, the most distinguished writers of this century, were the following. *Procopius*

up among the Benedictines, and after they came to their thrones retained attachment and reverence for the Order, to whom they were indebted for their education. The Benedictines were esteemed *saints*, and their prayers were supposed to be particularly efficacious. All this rendered the Order powerful and rich. But as soon as they became rich, they became voluptuous and indolent, and their cloisters were haunts of vice and wickedness. In the seventeenth century, this Order began to revert back to its original designs, especially in France; and it performed essential service to the republic of learning, in particular, by publishing beautiful editions of the Fathers. *Schl.*]

(18) See *Jo. Mabillon*, Diss. de vita monastica *Gregorii Magni*; annexed to *Hadr. Valesius*, Analect. veter. Tom. ii. and *Mabillon's* Praef. ad Saecul. i. [Acta Sanctor. Ord.] Benedict. p. xxix. &c. Yet some deny this, as *Anton. Gallanius*; [de Monachatu *Gregorii* &c.] on whose book, see *Rich. Simon*, Lettres choisies, Tom. iii. p. 63. [Yet the monkery of *Gregory* the Great, after the investigations of *Mabillon*, seems no longer liable to doubt. He established six monasteries in Sicily, and assigned them, out of his great riches, as much landed estate as was necessary for their support. A seventh monastery he founded at Rome, in his own house, dedicated to *St. Andrew*; which still exists, and is in the hands of the Camaldulensians. See *Fleury*, Histoire Eccles. Liv. xxxiv. § 34. *Schl.*]

(19) *Anton. Dandini Altessera*, Origines rei monasticae, Lib. i. cap. 9. p. 33. On the propagation of the Benedictine Rule in the various countries of Europe, *Jo. Mabillon* has a particular treatise, Praef. ad Saecul. i. [Acta Sanctor. Ord.] Benedict. and Praef. ad Saecul. iv. P. i. [Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Tom. v.] p. lxii &c. [*St. Maurus*, whose name a distinguished congregation still bears, was one of the most famous disciples of *Benedict*; though some have questioned his existence. *Placidus* was a historian of this order. Of *Augustine*, notice has already been taken. *Mellitus* preached to the east Saxons, and was afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, and very active in propagating the order.—The great and rapid dissemination of this order, was wonderful. Many particular and new orders, distinguished from each other, by their dress, their caps, and forms of government, originated from it. The Carthusians, Cisterians, Caelestines, Grandimontensians, Praemontensians, Cluniacensians, Camaldulensians, &c. were only branches growing out of this principal stock. The most respectable and renowned men were trained up in it. *Volaterranus* enumerates 200 cardinals, 1600 archbishops, 4000 bishops, and 15700 abbots and men of learning, who belonged to this order. *V. Einem.*]

(20) *Ja. l'Enfant*, Histoire du Concile de Coustance, Tome ii. p. 32, 33.

of Gaza expounded some books of the bible, not unhappily.(21) *John Maxentius*, a monk of Antioch, besides some books against the sects of his times, wrote *Scholia on Dionysius Areopagita*.(22) *Agapetus* procured himself a place among the wise men of the age, by his *Scheda Regia*, addressed to the emperor *Justinian*.(23) *Eulogius*, a presbyter of Antioch, was ardent and energetic in opposing the heresies of the times.(24) *John*, bishop of Constantinople, called the *Faster*, on account of the austerity of his life, distinguished himself by some small treatises, and particularly by his *Poenitential*.(25) *Leontius* of Byzantium has left us a book *against the heretics*, and some other writings.(26) *Evagrius*, Scholasticus, has furnished us with an *Ecclesiastical History*; but it is disfigured with fabulous tales.(27)

(21) See *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiast. de M. du Pin. Tome i. p. 197. [*Procopius*, a teacher of eloquence at Gaza, in the reign of *Justinian*, AD. 520 &c. has left us several Commentaries on the scriptures, which are chiefly compilations from earlier writers: viz. on the Octateuch, (extant only in Latin;) on the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, Gr. and Lat. Lugd. Bat. 1620. 4to. on Isaiah, Gr. and Lat. Paris 1580; on Proverbs, and the twelve Minor Prophets; never published. Also many neat Epistles, published by *Aldus*. Tr.]

(22) [*John Mazentius*, was a Scythian monk, and a presbyter of Antioch, who flourished about the year 520. Several of his epistles and tracts, defending the doctrine, that *one of the Trinity* was crucified, and opposing the Pelagian errors, are extant in Latin, in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Tom. ix. His scholia on *Dionysius* the Areopagite, are published Gr. and Lat. with that author. Tr.]

(23) [*Agapetus*, a deacon in the great church at Constantinople, flourished AD. 527. in which year he composed his *Instructions* for a prince, addressed to the emperor *Justinian*, then recently invested with the purple. The book contains 72 heads of advice, displaying good common sense, but not profound. It has been often published: as, Venice 1509. 8vo. and with a commentary, Franeker 1608. 8vo. Francf. 1659, 4to. Lips. 1669. 8vo. Tr.]

(24) [*Eulogius* of Antioch, was made bishop of Alexandria in the year 581. A homily of his is extant, Gr. and Lat. in *Combesis*, Auctuar. Nov. Tom. i. and large extracts from his vi Books against *Novatus*, his ii Books against *Timotheus* and *Severus*, his Book against *Theodosius* and *Severus*, and another against the compromise between the Theodosians and the Gainaites, are in *Photius*, Biblioth. Codex, No. 182, 208, 225—227. Tr.]

(25) [*John the Faster* was a native of Cappadocia, and bishop of Constantinople from 585 to 596. The title of *universal bishop* given him in the council of 589, involved him in trouble with *Pelagius II.* and *Gregory I.* bishops of Rome. Two of his Homilies are extant, Gr. and Lat. among those of *Chrysostom*; and his *Poenitential*, (or rules for treating penitents,) and a discourse on confessions and penitence, are published, Gr. and Lat. by *Morin*, de Poenitentia, Appendix, p. 77, 92. Tr.]

(26) [*Leontius* of Byzantium, was first an advocate, and then a monk in a monastery in Palestine, and flourished AD. 590 and onwards. *Cyrl* (in his life of *St. Sabas*, cap. 72,) says he was accused of Origenism. *Vossius* (de Hist. Gr. L. iv. c. 8.) thinks he was the same as *Leontius* bishop of Cyprus. He wrote de Sectis Liber, Gr. and Lat. in Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr. Paris 1624. Tom. i. p. 493. likewise adv. Eutychianos et Nestorianos, L. iii. adv. Fraudes Apollinaristar. Lib. ii. Solutiones Argumentorum Severi: Dubitationes et Definitiones contra eos, qui negant in Christo duas naturas; extant, in Latin, Biblioth. Patr. Tom. ix. also an Oration on the man blind from his birth, Gr. and Lat. in *Combesis*, Auctuar. Nov. Tom. i. and some other tracts, never published. Tr.]

(27) [*Evagrius*, Scholasticus, was born at Epiphania, in Syria, AD. 536. At four years of age, he was sent to school; after grammar, he studied rhetoric, and became an advocate at the bar in Antioch. He was much esteemed, and espe-

Anastasius, Sinaita, is generally supposed to be the author of a well known, yet futile book, entitled *Hodegus contra Acephalos* (a Guide against the Acephali). (28)

cially by *Gregory*, bishop of Antioch, whom he often assisted in difficult cases. The emperor *Tiberius* made him a quaestor; and *Maurice*, an honorary praefect. His only work, that has reached us, is his Ecclesiastical History, in vi Books. It is a continuation of the histories of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, from the council of Ephesus in 431, to the year 594. Its chief fault is, that of the age, credulity, and an over estimation of monkish legends and other trash. It was published, Gr. and Lat. by *Valesius*, among the other Gr. Eccles. Historians; and has been translated into English, Cambridge 1623. Fol. Tr.]

(24) See *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccles. de M. du Pin, Tome i. p. 232. and *Barut*, Bibliotheque choisie, Tome ii. p. 21 &c. [There were three persons, called *Anastasius Sinaita*. The first, after being a monk in the monastery on mount Sinai, was made patriarch of Antioch, AD. 561. but was banished in the year 570, for opposing the edict of *Justinian* respecting the incorruptibility of Christ's body. He was restored in 592, and died in 599. He was a learned, and orthodox man, and a considerable writer. The second of this name, was the immediate successor of the first in the see of Antioch, from AD. 599, to AD. 609, when he was murdered by the Jews. He translated the works of *Gregory* the Great, on the Pastoral office, from Latin into Greek: but the translation is lost.—The third *Anastasius*, flourished about AD. 685. He was a mere monk of mount Sinai. He wrote a compendious account of heresies, and of the councils that condemned them, from the earliest times, to the year 680; which still exists in M.S.—The 'Οδὴγὸς, or *Guide, to shun the Acephali*, is a rhapsody, without method, and without merit. It has been ascribed to the third *Anastasius*; because it contains several allusions to events posterior to the times of the two first of this name. Yet, as it relates to controversies in which the first *Anastasius* is known to have been much engaged, some have supposed it was originally composed by him, or from his writings, with subsequent additions or interpolations. It was printed, Gr. and Lat. by *Gretser*, Ingolst. 1604. 4to.—The 154 *Questions and Answers*, respecting biblical subjects, ascribed to the first *Anastasius*, and published Gr. and Lat. by *Gretser*, 1617, 4to; also bear marks of a later age. *Caze* supposes, they were compiled from the works of the first *Anastasius*. His xi Books of *Contemplations on the Hexameron*, were published in Latin, Paris 1609. Dr. *Alix* published the 12th Book, Gr. and Lat. Lond. 1682, 4to.—His five *doctrinal Discourses*, (on the Trinity, Incarnation, &c.) together with all the works just enumerated, are extant, in Latin, Biblioth. Patr. Tom. ix. Six of his *Homilies* are extant, Gr. and Lat. in *Combefis*, Auctuar. Nov. 1648. Tom. i. Another tract of his, on the three Quadregessimae, is extant, Gr. and Lat. in *Cotelier*, Monum. Eccl. Gr. tom. iii. Various other tracts of his exist only in MS. and a considerable number of others are lost.

The following is a catalogue of the Greek and oriental writers of this century, omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*.

Olympiodorus, a deacon at Alexandria, who probably flourished at the commencement of this century. He wrote several *commentaries* on the scriptures. His short *Comment on Ecclesiastes*, is extant Gr. and. Lat. in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuar. Tom. ii. His *Comment on Lamentations*, Lat. Rome 1598. 4to. and his *Commentary on Job*, is preserved almost entire, in the *Catena on Job*, published Gr. and Lat. by *Patr. Junius*, Lond. 1637. Fol.

Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus in Caria, a Eutychian, who flourished under *Anastasius* AD. 510, and was active in the contests of his times. On the accession of *Justin*, AD. 518, he fled to Alexandria; where he advanced the idea that *Christ's* body was always *incapable of corruption*; and produced a division and a party among the Monophysites. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, which is often quoted in the *Catena on Job*, published Lond. 1637. Fol.

Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople, AD. 511—517, distinguished for his hatred of his predecessor *Macedonius*. He wrote a book on the various heresies, which is extant, Gr. and Lat. in *Combefis*, Auctuar. Nov. Tom. ii. and more perfect, in *Cotelier*, Monum. Eccles. Gr. Tom. iii. p. 377.

Severus, a leading man among the *Acephali* or *Monophysites*, was in his youth

a pagan, and studied in the law school at Berytus : afterwards he became a monk at Gaza, and embracing and propagating Eutychian principles, was expelled the monastery. He repaired to Constantinople, and insinuated himself into the graces of the emperor *Anastasius*, who favored the Eutychians. In the year 513, on the expulsion of the orthodox *Flavian*, he was made patriarch of Antioch, subscribed the Henoticon of *Zeno*, and condemned the council of Chalcedon. Some bishops withdrew from his communion ; but, aided by Jews, he violently persecuted the orthodox, and especially the monks of Palestine, of whom he slew 350, and left their bodies to be consumed by beasts of prey. On the death of *Anastasius*, and accession of *Justin* to the empire, in 518, he was proscribed, and fled to Egypt, where he lived many years. Here he became involved with *Timothy*, patriarch of Alexandria and *Gainus* his deacon, by asserting that the body of *Christ*, previously to its resurrection, was corruptible. He now went to Constantinople ; and persuaded *Anthimus* the patriarch to embrace Eutychian principles ; and was producing great commotions, when two councils condemned him and *Anthimus*, AD. 536. His subsequent history is little known. He was a man of talents, ambitious, restless little careful to maintain consistency in conduct or belief, a great writer, and possessed of vast influence among the Eutychians. He wrote an immense number of epistles, many homilies and tracts, and extensive Commentaries on scripture ; none of which are published entire, his works having been proscribed and ordered to be all burned, by authority of the emperor. Yet numerous extracts are preserved ; and some whole treatises are supposed to exist still in the East. The *Ritual* for baptism and public worship in the Syrian church, which is extant, Syr. and Lat. Antw. 1572. 4to, has been attributed to him. His Commentaries are often quoted in the *Catena Patrum*. See *Cave*, *Histor. Litter.* Tom. i. p. 499 &c.

John, of Cappadocia, patriarch of Constantinople AD. 517—520. He condemned *Severus* of Antioch in 518 ; and the next year, by order of the emperor *Justin*, became reconciled with the Roman pontiffs. Five of his Epistles are extant in the *Concilia*, Tom. iv and v.

Theodorus, Lector, flourished at Constantinople AD. 518. He compiled an eccles. history from *Socrates*, *Sozomen* and *Theodoret*, in ii Books : to which he annexed a Continuation, in ii additional Books. Large extracts from the Continuation, by *Niephorus Calistus*, are preserved, and published, Gr. and Lat. among the Gr. Eccl. Historians, by *Valesius*.

Timotheus III, patriarch of Alexandria, AD. 519—535, a warm Eutychian, and protector of *Severus* and *Julian*, till he fell out with them respecting the corruptibility of *Christ's* body. He wrote numerous Sermons and theological tracts, large extracts from which are preserved by *Cosmas Indicopleustes*.

Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople AD. 520—535. He confirmed the reconciliation between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, made by *John* his predecessor ; and approved the council of Chalcedon. Five of his Epistles to *Hormisdas*, bishop of Rome, are extant, in *Concilior. Collect.* Tom. iv.

Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch, AD. 525—546. He was a native of Syria, a civil magistrate, and count of the East, when made bishop. He wrote pro Ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, et Synodo Chalcedonensi, Libri iii : which are lost, except copious extracts from the two first Books, in *Photius*, *Biblioth. Cod.* 228, 229.

Simeon, Stylites junior. In his childhood he mounted his pillar, near Antioch, which he occupied 68 years, AD. 527—595. He is often mentioned by *Evagrius*, who knew him well. His fifth Epistle to the emperor *Justinian*, is extant Gr. and Lat. in the transactions of the second Nicene council, Actio v. *Concilior.* Tom. vii. Some other tracts of his exist in MS. in the Vatican library.

Zacharias, Scholasticus, archbishop of Mytilene. He was first a lawyer at Berytus, then a bishop, and flourished AD. 536. While at Berytus, he wrote a Dissertation, or dialogue, against the philosophers who maintain that the world is eternal ; extant, Gr. and Lat. Lips. 1654. 4to, and in *Fr. Ducaeus' Auctuar.* Tom. i. He also wrote a disputation against the two first principles of all things, held by the Manichaeans ; extant, Lat. in *Henr. Canis. Antiquae. Lection.* Tom. v. and both works, in *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. ix.

Nonnosus, *Justinian's* ambassador to the Saracens, the Auxumitae, and the Homerites, about AD. 540. He wrote a history of his travels ; from which *Photius* has preserved extracts, *Biblioth. Cod.* 3.

Isaac, bishop of Nineva, who turned monk, and travelled as far as Italy. He

§ 9. Among the Latin writers, the most distinguished were the following. *Gregory the Great*, Roman Pontiff; a man of

flourished about the year 540. and wrote 87 ascetic discourses, which still exist in MS. A bad Latin translation of 53 of them, much garbled, was published in the *Biblioth. magn. Patr.* Tom. xi.

Arethas, archbishop of *Cesarea* in *Cappadocia*, is supposed to have lived about AD. 540. He compiled, from *Andreas Caesariensis*, an *Exposition of the Apocalypse*; extant, Gr. and Lat. annexed to *Oecumenius*, Paris 1631.

Gregentius, archbishop of *Taphar*, the metropolis of the *Homerites* in *Arabia Felix*, flourished AD. 540, and died 552. An account of his dispute with *Herbanus*, a learned Jew, is extant, Gr. and Lat. Paris 1586, 8vo, and in *Fr. Ducaeus*, *Auctuar.* Tom. i. He also compiled a code of civil laws, for the *Homerites*, by order of *Abram*, their king; which still exists in MS.

Barsanuphius, an anchorite of *Gaza*, in the middle of this century, composed a large amount of ascetic writings, which still exist; but are not thought worth publishing.

Eutychius, a monk, and bishop of *Constantinople*, AD. 553—585. In the year 564 he was deprived of his see and banished, by *Justinian*, for not admitting the incorruptibility of *Christ's* body, while he was on earth; but he was restored in the year 578, and died in 585, aged 73. One epistle of his, to pope *Vigilius*, is extant among the Acts of the fifth general council, AD. 553. *Concil.* Tom. v. p. 425.

Cyril, a monk of *Palestine*, who flourished AD. 557. He composed the lives of several monks, as of *St. John the Silentiary*, of *St. Euthymius*, and of *St. Sabas*; all of which are still extant.

Paul Cyrus Florus, a poet who flourished about AD. 555. His poetic description of the church of *St. Sophia* at *Constantinople*, built by *Justinian*, is still extant, Gr. and Lat. by *Carol. du Fresne*, Paris 1670, subjoined to the history of *Cinnamus*.

John, surnamed *Climacus*, from his book, and *Sinaita*, from his residence, also *Scholasticus*; a monk of mount *Sinai*, who flourished about AD. 564. He wrote *Scala Paradisi*, in 30 chapters, each marking a grade of virtue; also *Liber ad Pastorem*: both published Gr. and Lat. by *Matth. Rader*, Paris 1633. Fol.

John, Scholasticus, a presbyter at *Antioch*, deputy to *Constantinople*, and bishop there AD. 564—578. He wrote *Collectio Canonum*, in 50 Titles, and including the 85 Canons of the Apostles: also *Nomocanon*; which, besides a collection of Canons, contained an epitome of the civil laws concerning ecclesiastical affairs: likewise, *Capita Ecclesiastica*. All these tract were published, Gr. and Lat. in *Justell's* *Biblioth. Juris Canon.* Tom. ii. p. 499, 603, 660. ed. Paris 1662.

Theodorus, bishop of *Iconium*, about AD. 564, wrote the martyrdom of *Julitta* and her son *Cirycus*, only three years old, in the persecution of *Diocletian*: published, Gr. and Lat. by *Combesis*, *Acta Martyr. antiq.* Paris 1660. 8vo. p. 231.

Eustratius, a presbyter of the great church at *Constantinople*, under *Eutychius* the patriarch, about AD. 578. He wrote a book in confutation of those who say, the soul is inactive, when separated from the body: published Gr. and Lat. by *Leo Allat.* in his historical work concerning purgatory, Rome 1655. 8vo. p. 319—581. He also wrote the *Life of Eutychius* the patriarch; published Gr. and Lat. by *Surius* and by *Papebroch*.

Theophanes of *Byzantium*, flourished AD. 580, and wrote a History of the wars of the Romans with the Persians, AD. 567—573, in x Books; and some other parts of the history of his own times. Only extracts remain.

John, Maro, a very prominent man among the *Maronites*, who flourished about AD. 580. He wrote Commentaries on the Liturgy of *St. James*, which are still extant in Syriac, and have been much quoted by *Abr. Echellensis*, *Morin*, *Nairon*, and others.

Leontius, bishop of *Neapolis* or *Hagiopolis* in *Cyprus*, who flourished about AD. 600, and died about AD. 620 or 630. He wrote an Apology for the christians, against the Jews; of which a large part is preserved in the fourth Act of the second Nicene council; *Concilior.* Tom. vii. p. 236. He also wrote some homilies, and biographies of saints. But it is not easy to distinguish his writings, from those of *Leontius* of *Byzantium*. Tr.]

good and upright intentions, for the most part, but greatly lacking in judgment, superstitious, and opposed to all learning, as his *Epistles and Dialogues* show. (29) *Caesarius*, of Arles,

(29) His works were published, by the French Benedictine, *Denys de St. Marthe*, in four splendid volumes, Fol. Paris 1705. For an account of him, see the *Acta Sanctor.* Tom. ii. Martii, p. 121 &c. [*Gregory* the Great, of senatorian rank, was born at Rome about AD. 540. After a good education, being a youth of great promise, he was early admitted to the senate, and made governor of the city before he was thirty years old. The death of his father put him in possession of a vast estate; which he devoted wholly to pious and charitable uses. Renouncing public life, he became a monk, built and endowed six monasteries in Sicily, and a seventh at Rome, in which he himself lived under the control of the abbot. In 579, he was drawn from his monastery, ordained a deacon, and sent as papal legate to the court of Constantinople; where he resided five years, and became very popular. Returning in 584, with a rich treasure of relics, he retired to his monastery, and his favorite mode of life. In 590, he was raised to the papal chair, much against his will; and for 13 years and a half, was an indefatigable bishop, a zealous reformer of the clergy and the monasteries, and a strenuous defender of the prerogatives of his see. He failed in his attempt to coerce the Illyrian bishops to condemn the *three chapters*; but succeeded in disturbing the harmony between the orthodox and the Donatists in Africa. He discouraged all coercive measures for the conversion of the Jews; endeavored to confine the monks to their monasteries and to a more religious life; and attempted to eradicate the prevailing vices of the clergy, simony, and debauchery. He was instrumental in converting the Arian Lombards to the orthodox faith, and in restraining the ravages of that warlike people. He interfered in the discipline of foreign churches; remonstrated against an imperial law forbidding soldiers to become monks; labored to effect a peace between the Lombards and the emperors; and attended to every interest of the church and the people under him. Yet he claimed no civil authority; but always treated the emperors as his lords and masters. In 595, he commenced his long contest with the patriarchs of Constantinople, who had assumed the honorary title of *universal bishops*. This title, *Gregory* maintained to be blasphemous, antichristian, and diabolical, by whomsoever assumed. But he could not induce any of the orientals to join with him. In 596, he sent *Augustine* and other monks, to convert the Anglo-Saxons; which they accomplished. In 601, he defended the use of images in churches; allowed the Saxons to retain some of their pagan customs; and endeavored to extend the power of *Augustine* over the ancient British churches. In the same year, when *Phocas*, the usurper, murdered all the imperial family, and clothed himself with the purple, *Gregory* obsequiously flattered him, and submitted to his usurpation. At length, worn out with cares and disease, he died in March AD. 604, having reigned thirteen years and a half. *Gregory* was exceedingly active, self-denying, submissive to his superiors, and courteous, sympathetic and benevolent to all; yet he was an enthusiast for monkery, and for the honor of his see. His writings are more voluminous than those of any other Roman pontiff. His letters amount to 840; besides which, he wrote 35 Books on *Job*, called *Gregory's Morals*; a *Pastoral*, a treatise on the duties of a pastor, in 4 Books; 22 Homilies on *Ezekiel*; 40 Homilies on the Gospels; 4 Books of Dialogues. To him are ascribed also, an Exposition of the first book of *Samuel*, in vi Books; an Exposition of the seven penitential Psalms; and an Exposition of the *Canticles*. His best works are his *Pastoral* and his *Morals*. His *Dialogue* is stuffed with monkish tales; and the Exposition of the penitential Psalms breathes the spirit of later times, and has been ascribed to *Gregory VII*. The best edition, is said to be, that of *St. Marthe*; but that of *de Sousainville*, Paris 1675, 3 vol. Fol. is esteemed: the latest edition is that of *Joh. Bapt. Gallicciolli*, Venice 1768—76, in 17 vol. 4to.—His life by *Paulus Diaconus*, of the 9th century; and another by *John*, deacon at Rome, about 880, in iv Books; are in *Mabillon's Acta Sanctor.* Ord. Bened. Tom. i. p. 378—484. Among the moderns, besides *du Pin*, *Bayle*, and *Oudin*, we have *Maimbourg's Histoire du Pontificat de S. Gregoire le Grand*, Paris 1686, 4to: *Denys de St. Marthe*, *Histoire de S. Greg. le Gr.* Rouen 1698, 4to, and in the *Opp. Greg. M.* Tom. iv. p. 199—305. See also *Bower*, *Lives of the*

composed some tracts on moral subjects, and a *Rule for holy virgins*.(30) *Fulgentius*, of Ruspe in Africa, contended valiantly, in numerous books, against the Pelagians and the Arians;(31) but his diction is harsh and uncouth, like that of most Africans. *Ennodius*, of Pavia, was not contemptible among the writers of this age, either for prose or poetry; but he was an infatuated adulator of the Roman pontiff, whom he exalted to supreme power on earth, maintaining that he was amenable to no authority of mortals.(32) *Benedict* of Nursia, whose name is

Popes (Gregory I) vol. ii. p. 463—543. ed. Lond. 1750. and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchen-gesch.* vol. xvii. p. 243—371. *Tr.*]

(30) The Benedictines have recently given a learned account of *Caesarius*, in their *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Tom. iii. p. 190. [His life written by his pupils, *Cyprian*, *Messian*, and *Stephan*, in two Books, is extant in *Mabillon*, *Acta SS. Ord. Benedict.* Tom. i. p. 636—654. He was born in Gaul, AD. 469. While a boy, he ran away, and entered the monastery of Lerins; where he lived many years, and became the butler. His health failing, he retired to Arles; of which place he was made bishop in the year 502. In the year 506, he was falsely accused of treason, and banished by *Alaric*, king of the Visigoths, to Bourdeaux; but soon recalled. In 508, *Theodoric*, king of the Goths, summoned him to Ravenna to answer a similar charge. Being acquitted, he visited Italy, and returned to Arles. He presided at the council of Arles, in 524; and at that of Valencia in 529, he triumphantly maintained the principle, that a man cannot obtain salvation, without *preventing* grace. He died AD. 542, aged 73. He was zealous for monkery, and a strenuous advocate for the doctrines of *Augustine*, respecting free grace and predestination. He has left us 46 Homilies, a Rule for monks, another for nuns, a treatise on the ten virgins, an exhortation to charity, an Epistle, and his Will. He also wrote two Books on grace and free will, against *Faustus*, which are lost. His works are printed in the *Biblioth. Patr.* vol. viii. and vol. xxvii. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litter.* Tom. i. p. 492. *Tr.*]

(31) See, concerning *Fulgentius*, the *Acta Sanctor.* Tom. i. Januarii, p. 32 &c. [He was born at Carthage, about AD. 468. His father, who was a senator, died while he was young; but his mother gave him an excellent education. While a boy, he had all *Homer* by wrote, and could talk Greek fluently. He was early made procurator of the city. But soon weary of public life, he retired to a monastery, became a monk and an abbot, changed his monastery, endured persecution from the Arians, went to Syracuse, and thence to Rome in the year 500; returned to Africa again, was elected bishop of Ruspe in 507, was banished to Sardinia, by *Thrasimund* the Arian king of the Vandals, recalled by *Hilderic*, the succeeding king, and ruled his church till his death in 533. He was one of the most learned, pious, and influential bishops of his age. He wrote three Books *ad Monimum*, (on predestination and kindred doctrines;) one Book against the Arians; three Books *ad Thrasimundum regem*, (on the person and offices of *Christ*;)—ten Sermons on divers subjects; *de Fide orthodoxa Liber ad donatum*; *de Fide Liber ad Petr. Diacon.* eleven Epistles; *de Trinitate Liber*; on Predestination and Grace, three Books; and various other Tracts, and Homilies: all of which were published, Paris 1684, 4to. Among his lost works, were seven Books on grace and free will, addressed to *Faustus*, and ten Books on predestination and grace, against *Fabian*. See *Cave's*, *Hist. Lit.* Tom. i. p. 493. *Tr.*]

(32) See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, Tom. iii. p. 96 &c. [*Ennodius* was born AD. 473, of a proconsular family. He married young; was afterwards deacon at Pavia, and subsequently at Rome; was twice papal legate to the emperor at Constantinople; was made bishop of Pavia in 511, and died in 521. He wrote nine Books of *Epistles*, or 297 in number; unpublished, and of little use to the history of his times; a *Panegyric* on *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths; an *Apology* for the Synod of Rome AD. 503; the life of *Epiphanius*, his predecessor at Pavia; life of *Antony*, a monk of Lerins; two Books of poems or epigrams; and various other little pieces: all of which were published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris 1611, 8vo; and in the *Works of Sirmond*, vol. i. Paris 1696; also in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. ix. *Tr.*]

immortalized by his *Rule* for a monastic life, and the numerous families of monks who have followed it.(33) *Dionysius*, surnamed *Exiguus* on account of his lowliness of mind, has deserved well of his own age and of posterity, by his *collection of ancient canons*, and his chronological researches.(34) *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, an African, procured himself reputation by some small treatises, especially by his *Abridgement of the canons*; but his diction has no charms.(35) *Facundus*, of Hermiane, was a strenuous defender of the *three chapters*, of which an account will be given hereafter.(36) *Arator* versified the Acts of the Apostles, in Latin, not badly.(37) *Primasius*, of Adrumetum, wrote *Commentaries on the epistles of Paul*, and a *book on heresies*; which are yet extant.(38) *Liberatus*, by his *Breviarium*,

(33) [See above, pa. 465, § 6. and Note (15) He has left us nothing in writing, except his monastic regulations, two Epistles, and two discourses; which are in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. ix. p. 640 &c. Tr.]

(34) [A monk of Scythian extract, who flourished at Rome AD. 533, and died before AD. 556. He was intimate with *Cassiodorus*; who gives him a high character, for intelligence and virtue. Being familiar with Greek, he collected and translated a body of canons, including the first 50 Apostolic Canons, and those of the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon, Sardica, and some in Africa; he also made a collection of the decrees of the Roman pontiffs, from *Siricius* to *Anastasius II*: both are extant in *Justell's* Biblioth. Juris Coninici, Tom. i. He likewise translated a synodic epistle of *Cyril* of Alex. a paschal epistle of *Proterius*, the life of *St. Pachomius*, an Oration of *Procius*, *Gregory Nyssen* de opificio hominis, and a history of the discovery of the head of *John* the Baptist: and composed a Paschal Cycle of 97 years, commencing AD. 527, of which only a fragment remains. In the last work, he proposed that christians should use the *time of Christ's birth* as their *era*; which proposal was soon followed universally. Hence, the christian era is called the *Dionysian era*. But *Dionysius* miscalculated the *time of Christ's birth*, placing it 4 years (as most writers suppose) too late. Tr.]

(35) [*Fulgentius Ferrandus* was a pupil of *Fulgentius Ruspensis*, and a deacon at Carthage. He flourished AD. 533 and onwards. His *Abridgment* of the canons, is a short digest of ecclesiastical law, reduced to 232 heads: it is in *Justell's* Biblioth. Juris Canon. Tom. i. He also wrote the life of *Fulgentius* of Ruspe, and seven doctrinal Epistles. All his works were published by *Chifflet*, Dijon 1649, 4to. and then in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. ix. Tr.]

(36) [*Facundus* was bishop of Hermiane in Africa, but spent many years at Constantinople, as a representative of the African churches at the imperial court. It was here, and in the years 546 and 547, that he composed his twelve Books pro defensione trium Capitulorum, which he presented to the emperor *Justinian*. He also wrote a book against *Mutianus* Scholasticus, who had inveighed against the African churches for refusing communion with *Vigilius*. These, together with an *Epistle* in defence of the three chapters, were published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris 1629, 8vo. and annexed to *Optatus* of Milevi, Paris 1675, Fol. and thence in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. p. 1, 109. Tr.]

(37) [*Arator* was first an advocate, then one of the court of king *Athalaric*, and finally a subdeacon at Rome. He flourished from AD. 527, to 544; in which latter year he presented his poetic version of the Acts, in two Books, to *Vigilius* the Roman pontiff. He was much esteemed and honored both by *Athalaric* and *Vigilius*. The poem was first published, with a commentary, at Salamanca, 1516; and afterwards in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. p. 125. Tr.]

(38) [*Primasius*, bishop of Adrumetum or Justinianopolis in Africa, was a delegate to the court of Constantinople, AD. 550 and 553, and defended the *three chapters*. His *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul*, was compiled from *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others. He likewise composed a *mystical Ex-*

or concise history of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, merits a respectable place among the writers of these times.(39) *Fortunatus* possessed a happy vein for poetry, which he employed on various subjects, so that he is read with pleasure at the present day.(40) *Gregory of Tours*, the Father of French history, would have been in higher esteem with the moderns, if his *Annals of the Franks* and his other writings did not exhibit so many marks of weakness and credulity.(41) *Gildas of Britain*, is not to be passed over, because he is the most ancient of the British writers, and because his little book *on the destruction of Britain*, contains many things worth being known.(42) *Co-*

position of the Apocalypse, in five Books. Both are in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. He moreover wrote *de Hæresibus Libri III*; which are lost, unless they are those published in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. xxvii, the author of which has been so much disputed. See *Cave*, Hist. Litterar. Tom. i. p. 525 &c. Tr.]

(39) [*Liberatus* was archdeacon of the church of Carthage. He was sent twice as a legate to Rome, in 534 and 535. His *Breviarium* is esteemed very authentic and correct, though not elegant. It contains the history of that controversy for 125 years, or to about AD. 553; and was the result of great research and labor. It was published by *Garnier*, Paris 1675, 8vo. and in most of the Collections of Councils. Tr.]

(40) *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, Tom. iii. p. 464. [*Venantius Honorarius Clementianus Fortunatus* was born in Italy, and educated at Ravenna. About the middle of the century, having been cured of his diseased eyes by *St. Martin* of Tours, he determined to visit the tomb of that saint. From Tours, he went to Poitiers, where he lived to the end of the century; wrote much, became a presbyter, and at last bishop of Poitiers. His poetic works are, two Books of short poems, dedicated to *Gregory of Tours*; four Books, on the life of *St. Martin*; and several other short poems. They are in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. and were published by *Brower*, Mogunt. 1603, and 1616, 4to. His prose writings are short Explanations of the Lord's Prayer and of the Apostles Creed; and the lives of 8 or 10 Gallic saints; viz. *St. Albinus*, bishop Angers; *St. Germanus*, bishop of Paris; *St. Radegund*, a queen; *St. Hilarius*, bishop of Poitiers; *St. Marcellus*, bishop of Paris; *St. Amantius*, bishop of Rodez; *St. Remigius*, bishop of Rheims; and *St. Paternus*, bishop of Avranches. The two following are doubtful; *St. Mauritius*, bishop of Angers; and *St. Medard*, bishop of Noyon. All these are extant either in *Surius*, or *Mabillon's* collections. Tr.]

(41) A particular account is given of him, in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, Tom. iii. p. 372. For an account of his faults, see *Fran. Pagi*, Diss. de *Dionysio Paris.* § xxv. p. 16, annexed to his *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.* Tom. iv. But many of his defects are extenuated by *Jo. Launoy*, Opp. Tom. i. P. II. p. 131 &c. [*Georgius Florentinus Gregorius* was born of noble parentage, at Auvergne, AD. 544. After an education under his bishop, he went to Tours in the year 556, became deacon in 569, and bishop in 573, and died in 595, aged 52. He was much engaged in councils, and in theological disputes, and at the same time a great writer. Orthodox, active, and rather indiscreet, he was frequently involved in difficulties, for he was deficient in judgment and acumen. His great work, *Annales Francorum*, (sometimes called *Chronica*, *Gesta*, *Historia*, and *Historia Ecclesiastica Francorum*,) in ten Books, gives a summary history of the world, from the creation to the establishment of the kingdom of the Franks; and afterwards a detailed history, to the year 591. He also wrote *Miraculorum Libri vii*; containing the miracles of *St. Martin*, in four Books; on the glory of Martyrs, two Books; and on the glory of Confessors, one Book. Besides these, he wrote *de vitis Patrum* (monks) *Liber unus*; *de vita et morte vii dormientium*; and an *Epitome* of the history of the Franks, composed before he wrote his *Annales*. All his works, collectively, were best edited by *Theod. Ruinart*, Paris 1699, Fol. They are also in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. xi. Tr.]

(42) Concerning *Gildas* and *Columbanus*, none have treated more accurately than the Benedictines, in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, Tom. iii. p. 279

lumbanus, of Ireland, acquired celebrity, by his *Rule* for monks, some poems, and uncommon zeal for the erection of monasteries.(43) *Isidorus*, of Seville, (Hispalensis,) composed various grammatical, theological, and historical works; but shows himself to have lacked a sound judgment.(44) The list of Latin authors in this century, may be well closed by two very learned men, the illustrious *Boethius*, a philosopher, orator, poet, and theologian, who was second to no one of his times for elegance and acuteness of genius;(45) and *M. Aurelius Cassiodorus Sen-*

and 505. [*Gildas* was surnamed the *Wise*, and also *Badonius*, from the battle of *Badon* (*Bath*) about the time of his birth, which was AD. 520. By these epithets he is distinguished from *Gildas Albanus*, who lived a little earlier. He was well educated, became a monk of *Bangor*, and is said to have visited and labored sometime in Ireland. On his return he visited the monastery of *Lhancarvan*, lately founded by a nobleman of south Wales; whose example, *Gildas* urged others to imitate. He spent some time in the northern part of Britain; visited France and Italy; and returned and labored as a faithful preacher. He is supposed to have died at *Bangor*, AD. 590; though some place his death 20 years earlier. His only entire work, now existing, is his *Epistola de excidio Britanniae, et castigatione Ordinis Ecclesiastici*; in which he depicts and laments over the almost total ruin of his country, and the profligacy of manners then prevailing. It was first published by *Polydore Virgil*, in 1525; but the best edition is that of *Tho. Gale*, in the first vol. of his *Historiae Britannicae, Saxonicae &c. Scriptores quindecim*, Lond. 1691, Fol. He also wrote several letters, and perhaps some other pieces, of which only extracts remain. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litter.* Tom. i. p. 538 &c. Tr.]

(43) For a notice of *Columbanus*, see above, p. 465, Note (14). Tr.]

(44) [*Isidorus Hispalensis*, or *junior*, was the son of *Severian*, prefect of Carthage in Spain, and brother of *Fulgentius*, bishop of Carthage, and of *Leander*, whom he succeeded AD. 595, as bishop of Seville. He presided in the council of Seville in 619, and in that of Toledo AD. 633, and died AD. 636. He was a voluminous writer; and has left us a *Chronicon*, from the creation, to AD. 626; *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum, et Suevorum*; *Originum*, sive *Etymologiarum Libri xx*; *de Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, (a continuation of *Jerome* and *Gennadius*, embracing twenty three writers); *de vita et morte Sanctorum utriusque Testamenti Liber*; *de divinis sive ecclesiasticis Officiis*, Libri ii; *de differentiis sive proprietate verborum Libri ii*; *Synonymorum sive soliloquiorum Libri ii*; *de natura rerum sive de mundo*, Liber philosophicus; *Liber proemium ad libros utriusque Testamenti*; *Commentaria in libros historicos Veteris Test.* (a compilation); *Allegoriarum quarundam S. Scripturae Liber*; *contra nequitiam Judaeorum Libri ii*; *Sententiarum*, sive *de summo bono Libri iii*; *Regula Monachorum*; *de conflictu vitiorum et virtutum Liber*; *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*; several *Epistles* and minor treatises. To him is falsely ascribed a collection of councils and decretals. His works were best published Paris 1601, Fol. and Cologne 1617, Fol. Tr.]

(45) [*Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boethius*, born of an illustrious family at Rome, about AD. 470, was sent in his childhood to Athens for education, where he spent eighteen years; and then returned to Rome, the most learned man of the age. He was consul in the years 510, and 522. Soon after his return to Rome, he was made a patrician, and admitted to the senate. When *Theodoric* king of the Goths entered Rome, AD. 500, *Boethius* was appointed by the senate to address him. The king soon after made him one of his council, and master of his palace. After faithfully serving the king and his country, for more than twenty years, he was in 523, falsely accused of a treasonable correspondence, condemned on suborned testimony, and sent to *Pavia*, where he was kept in close confinement a year or more, and then privately put to death by order of the king. He was a voluminous writer. Besides more than forty Books of translations and commentaries on *Aristotle*, *Porphyrus*, and *Cicero*, he wrote ii Books on arithmetic, v Books on music, ii Books on geometry, and several

ator, who was indeed inferior in many respects to the former, yet no contemptible author.(46) Both have left us various productions of their pens.(47)

tracts against the Eutychians, Nestorians, and other errorists. But his most famous work, was *de consolatione philosophiae Libri v.* written while in prison at Pavia. This was translated into Saxon, by *Alfred* the Great, (printed, Oxford 1698;) and into English by *Chaucer*, and by queen *Elizabeth*. It was composed partly in verse, and partly in prose; and has the form of a dialogue between *Boethius* himself, and *Philosophy* personified; who endeavors to console him with considerations, derived not from christianity, but from the doctrines of *Plato*, *Zeno*, and *Aristotle*. The works of *Boethius* were published with notes, Basil 1570. Fol. See *Care*, Hist. Litterar. Tom. i. p. 495 &c. and *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos. Tom. iii. *Gervaise*, Histoire de Boëce, Paris 1715. 2 vol. 8vo. and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xvi. p. 99—121. Tr.]

(46) See *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothèque eccles. de *M. du Pin*, Tome i. p. 211 &c. [*Senator* was part of the name, not the title, of *Cassiodorus*. This eminent statesman and monk, was born of honorable parents, at Squillace in the kingdom of Naples, probably before AD. 470. *Odoacer*, in 491, made him Comes rerum privatarum et sacrarum largitionum. Two years after, *Theodoric* became master of Italy, and made him his private secretary; and subsequently governor of Calabria; but soon recalled him to court, and made him successively quaestor of the palace, master of the officers, consul, and praetorian prefect. The death of *Theodoric* in 526, did not deprive *Cassiodorus* of his high rank; but in 539, being now about 70 years old, he retired to a monastery, founded by himself near his native town in Calabria, where he lived more than twenty years in honorable retirement, devoted to literature and religion. His works are voluminous; viz. *Epistolarum Libri xii*, (his official letters;) *Historiae Eccles. Tripartitae Lib. xii*, (an abridgment from the Latin translations of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, by *Epiphanius Scholasticus*;) *Chronicon*, ab Adamo usque ad annum 519; *Computus Paschalis*; *de Rebus Gestis Gothorum Lib. xii*, (which we have, as abridged by *Jornandes*; the original is supposed still to exist in MS. ;) *Expositio in Psalmos Davidis*; *Institutionis ad divinas lectiones Lib. ii*; *de Orthographia Liber*; *de vii Disciplinis Liber*, (on the *seven* liberal arts; viz. the *trivium*, or grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the *quadrivium*, or arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy;) *de Anima Liber*; *de Oratione*, et viii partibus Orationis; short Comments on the Acts, the Epistles, and apocalypse, (published separately by bishop *Chandler*, Lond. 1722, 8vo.) Most of the other works are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. xi, and all of them were well edited by the *Benedictines*, in ii vol. Fol. Rouen 1679. See *Care*, Histor. Litterar. Tom. i. p. 501. and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xvi. p. 128—154. Tr.]

(47) [The following are the Latin writers omitted by Dr. *Mosheim*.

Paschasius, deacon of the church of Rome, who took sides with *Laurentius*, in his contest for the pontificate in 498, and died in 512. He has left us an *Epistle* to *Eugyppius*; and ii Books on the Holy Spirit, against *Macedonius*; which are in the 8th vol. of the *Biblioth. Patrum*.

Laur. entius, bishop of Novara in the north of Italy, flourished about AD. 507. Two of his *Homilies*, on penitence and alms, are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. ix.

Epiphanius Scholasticus, an Italian, who flourished about AD. 510. He translated the *Eccles. Histories* of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, into Latin; that *Cassiodorus* might thence make out his *Historia Eccles. Tripartita*, in xii Books. The original translations are lost.

Eugyppius, abbot of a monastery near Naples, about AD. 511. He wrote the life of *St. Severinus*, the apostle of Noricum; published by *Surius*.

Hormisdas, Roman pontiff AD. 514—523; who made peace, after a long contest, between the oriental and western churches. He has left us eighty *Epistles*, and some *Decretals*, in the *Concilor.* Tom. iv.

Orentius, or *Orientius*, bishop of Eliberis in Spain, AD. 516. He wrote *Com-mitorium fidelibus*, metro Heroico, in ii Books. The first Book is in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. vii; and both, with other short poems, in *Edm. Martene*, *Thesaur. Anecd.* Tom. v. Paris, 1717.

Peter, a deacon, who vigorously aided the deputation of oriental monks at Rome, AD. 520, and wrote *de Incarnatione et gratia D. N. Jesu Christi, Liber*; extant among the works of *Fulgentius*, and in *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. ix.

Felix iv. Roman pontiff AD. 526—530. Three *Epistles*, in the Concilior. Tom. iv, are ascribed to him; but the two first are spurious.

Justinian I. emperor AD. 527—565. Besides the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, (viz. *Institutionum* Lib. iv. *Pandectar. sive Digestorum* Lib. l. *Codicis* Lib. xii, AD. 528—535; and *Novellae*, after AD. 535.) he issued six *Decrees* and *Epistles* relating to ecclesiastical affairs, which are in the Concilior. Tom. v.

Nicetius, of Gallic extract, a monk, abbot, and archbishop of Treves AD. 527—568. He was distinguished for piety, and the confidence reposed in him. Two of his tracts, *de Vigilis Serrorum Dei*, and *de Bona Psalmodia*, were published by *Dacherius*, *Spicilegium* Tom. iii. (ed. nova Tom. i. p. 221, 223); and two of his letters, (to the emperor *Justinian*, and to queen *Chlosuinda*,) are in the Concilior. Tom. v.

Justus, bishop of Urgel, in Catalonia, Spain, flourished AD. 529, and died about AD. 540. His *Commentary on the Canticles* is in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. ix. Two *epistles* of his, are also extant.

Boniface II, Roman pontiff AD. 530—532, has left us two *Epistles*; in the Concilior. Tom. iv.

Cogitosus, an Irish monk, grandson of *St. Brigit*, and supposed to have lived about AD. 530. He wrote *Vita Sanctae Brigidae*; which is published by *Canisius*, *Surius*, and *Bolland*.

Montanus, archbishop of Toledo in Spain, during nine years, about AD. 531. He has left us two *Epistles*; extant in the Concilior. Tom. iv.

John II, Roman pontiff AD. 532—535. At the request of *Justinian*, he solemnly sanctioned the orthodoxy of the expression: *One of the Trinity suffered crucifixion*. One spurious and five genuine *Epistles* of his, are in the Concilior. Tom. iv.

Marcellinus, Comes of Illyricum, flourished AD. 534. His *Chronicon*, (from the year 379, where *Jerome's* closes, to the year 534,) has been often published; and is in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. ix.

Agapetus, Roman pontiff AD. 535, 536. Seven of his *Epistles* (one of them spurious) are in the Concilior. Tom. iv. and one in Tom. v.

Vigilius, Roman pontiff AD. 537—555. He obtained his see by intrigue and duplicity; conspired against his predecessor, whom he brought to the grave; and when confirmed in his see, shewed himself supremely ambitious, and ready to sacrifice consistency, conscience, the truth itself, to promote his own selfish designs. He issued the most solemn declarations, both for and against the three chapters. In 547 *Justinian* called him to Constantinople, where he detained him seven years, and compelled him to condemn the three chapters, and himself also, for having repeatedly defended them. We have 18 *Epistles*, and several of his contradictory *Decretals*, in the Concilior. Tom. v.

Gordianus, a monk of Messina, carried off by the Saracens, in the year 539, when they burned and plundered that monastery. *Gordian* escaped from the Saracens and returned to Sicily, where he wrote the *life of Placidus*, the Benedictine abbot of Messina, who with many others, was slain, in the capture of that monastery. It is extant in *Surius*, and in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor*. Tom. i.

Victor, bishop of Capua, about AD. 545. He translated into Latin *Ammonius* Harmony of the iv Gospels, falsely ascribed to *Tatian*; and extant in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. iii. p. 265.

Cyprianus, a Gaul, and pupil of *Caesarius* of Arles. He flourished AD. 546, and wrote the *first book* of the *life and achievements of Caesarius*. Both books are in *Surius*, and in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor*. Tom. i.

Mutianus Scholasticus, flourished AD. 550. At the suggestion of *Cassiodorus*, he translated 34 Homilies of Chrysostom on the Ep. to the Hebrews into Latin; printed at Cologne 1530.

Rusticus, a deacon at Rome, who accompanied pope *Vigilius* to Constantinople, in 547, and showed more firmness than his bishop. His *Dialogus sive disputatio adversus Acephalos*, (in which he inveighs against *Vigilius*,) is extant in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x.

Junilius, an African bishop who lived about AD. 550, has left us *de Partibus Divinae Legis Libri* ii. in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. p. 339.

Jornandes, or *Jordanus*, of Gothic extract, bishop of the Goths at Ravenna. His one Book *de Rebus Geticis*, or *Historia Gothorum*, from the earliest times to AD. 540, is an abridgment of the 12 Books of *Cassiodorus*, on the same subject. His *de Regnorum et Temporum successione Liber*, is transcribed from *Florus*. Both works are extant in *Muratori*, *Rerum Italicar. Scriptores*, Tom. i. 1723.

Eugippius, an African presbyter and abbot, who flourished about AD. 553. He compiled from the works St. *Augustine* a collection of sentences on various subjects, in 338 chapters; printed, Basil 1542.

Victor, bishop of Tunis in Africa, a resolute defender of the three chapters, in prisons and banishments, from AD. 555—565. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from the creation to AD. 566; but the last 122 years of it, are all that remain; published by *Scaliger*, with the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*.

Germanus, (*St. Germain*), born at *Autun*, France, AD. 496; deacon, 533; presbyter, 536; and bishop of Paris, AD. 555—576. An epistle of his to queen *Brunechild*, written AD. 573, is in the Concilior. Tom. v. His life, written by *Venantius Fortunatus*, is in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* Tom. i p. 222 &c.

Pelagius I, Roman pontiff AD. 555—559. He was papal legate at Constantinople AD. 535—545; and a strenuous opposer of the three chapters. Sixteen of his Epistles are in the Concilior. Tom. v.

Martin, a monk, born in Pannonia. He travelled in Palestine, preached and became an abbot in Spain, and finally bishop of Braga in Portugal, AD. 563—583. He has left us *Collectio Canonum*, (extant, in Concilior. Tom. v. and in *Justell's* Biblioth. Juris Canon. Tom. i.); *Sententias patrum Aegyptiorum*, (in *Rosciyd*, de vitis Patr.); and *Formula honestae vitae*, extant in the Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. p. 282.

Pelagius II, Roman pontiff AD. 579—590. He had much contention with the western bishops, who defended the three chapters; and, after AD. 589, with *John*, bishop of Constantinople, who assumed the title of *universal bishop*. Ten of his Epistles, and six Decrees, are extant, in the Concilior. Tom. v.

Marius, bishop of Avenches in Switzerland, for 20 years, flourished AD. 581. He has left us a *Chronicon*, continuing that of *Prosper*, from 455 to 581.

Licinianus, bishop of Carthagera, in Spain, AD. 584. He has left us three Epistles; in *dé Aguirre*, *Collect. max. Concil. Hispan.* Tom. ii.

John, a Spanish Goth, educated at Constantinople, returned to Spain AD. 584, became an abbot, was persecuted by *Leuvigild* the Arian king, and died early in the 7th century. He has left a *Chronicon*, from AD. 565, to 590.

Leander, archbishop of Seville (*Hispalensis*) in Spain, flourished AD. 583, and died 595. He was a monk, an ambassador to Constantinople, and a principal means of the conversion of the Arian Goths of Spain to the catholic faith. A monastic *Rule* is all we have of him; unless he was author of the *Missa Mozarabum*.

Dynamius, collector of the revenues of the Romish church in Gaul. He flourished AD. 593. and wrote the life of *St. Maximus*, bishop of Reiz; and the life of *St. Marius*, abbot of Bobi.

Eutropius, a monk, and bishop of Valencia in Spain, flourished AD. 599. One of his Epistles is preserved by *Lu. Holstenius*, *Codex Regular.* Paris 1663. Tr.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Continued sinking of theology.—§ 2. This exemplified.—§ 3. State of exegetical theology.—§ 4. Faults of the interpreters.—§ 5. Dogmatic theology.—§ 6. Practical theology.—§ 7. Lives of saints.—§ 8. Polemic theology.—§ 9. Contests about Origenism.—§ 10. about the three chapters.—§ 11. The fifth general council.—§ 12. Contest about one of the Trinity being crucified.

§ 1. The barriers of the ancient simplicity and truth being once violated, the state of theology waxed worse and worse; and the amount of the impure and superstitious additions to the religion of *Christ*, is almost indescribable. The controversial theologians of the East, continued to darken the great doctrines of revelation, by the most subtle distinctions, and with the jargon of their philosophy. Those who instructed the people at large, made it their sole care to imbue them more and more with ignorance, superstition, reverence for the clergy, and admiration of empty ceremonies; and to divest them of all sense and knowledge of true piety. Nor was this strange, for *the blind*,—that is persons for the most part grossly ignorant and thoughtless,—*were the leaders of the blind*.

2. Whoever wishes to gain more distinct information on this subject, need only read what occurs in the epistles and other writings of *Gregory* the Great, among others, respecting the worshipping of images and departed saints, the fire which purifies souls after death, the efficacy of good works, that is, of human prescriptions and devices for attaining salvation, the power of relics to remove defects both of soul and body, and other things of the like character. A man of sense cannot help smiling, at the generosity of the good *Gregory* in distributing his relics; but he must feel pity for the simple, stupid people, who could be persuaded, that oil taken from lamps burning at the sepulchres of the martyrs, possessed uncommon virtues and efficacy, and added both holiness and security to its possessors.(1)

§ 3. To give directions for expounding the holy scriptures, was the object of *Junilius*, in his two Books *on the parts of the divine law*.(2) The treatise consists of a few questions, neither

(1) See the *List of sacred oils*, which *Gregory* the Great sent to queen *Theodelinda*; in Theod. *Ruinart*, Acta martyr. sincera et selecta, p. 619, [and in *Mura-tori*, Anecdota Latina, Tom. ii. p. 194. *Schl.*]

(2) See Rich. *Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque de M. du Pin, Tom i. p. 229.

scientifically arranged, nor judiciously considered; for the author lacked the learning necessary for his undertaking. *Cassiodorus* likewise laid down some rules for interpretation, in his two Books *on the divine laws*. Among the Syrians, *Philoxenus* translated the books of the New Testament and the Psalms of David into Syriac.(3) The number of interpreters was considerable. Among the Greeks, the best were *Procopius* of Gaza, (rather a pleasing expositor,)(4) *Severus* of Antioch, *Julianus*, and some others. Among the Latins, the more prominent were *Gregory* the Great, *Cassiodorus*, *Primasius*,(5) *Isidorus* of Seville,(6) *Bellator*,(7) and a few others.

§ 4. All these expositors, a few only excepted, (and particularly the Nestorians in the East, who following the example of *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, searched for the true sense and meaning of the words,) are scarcely worthy of the name of Interpreters. They may be divided into two classes. Some merely collected the opinions and interpretations of the earlier doctors, in works which were afterwards called *Catenae* (or *Chains*) by the Latins.(8) Such is the *Catena* of *Olympiodorus* on Job, that of *Victor* of Capua on the four Gospels, and the Commentary of *Primasius* on the Epistle to the Romans, compiled from Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and others. Nor is *Procopius* of Gaza to be wholly excluded from this class, although he sometimes followed his own judgment. The others follow the footsteps of *Origen*, and neglecting wholly the literal meaning, run after allegories and moral precepts, deducing whatever they wish or desire from the sacred books, by the aid of a roving imagination. Of this class, is *Anastasius* Sinaita, whose *Anagogical Contemplations on the Hexaëmeron* expose the ignorance and credulity of the author; likewise *Gregory* the Great, whose *Morals on Job* were formerly extolled undeservedly; also *Isidorus* of Seville, in his *Book of allegories on Scripture*; and *Primasius*, in his *Mystic exposition of the Apocalypse*; and many others.

§ 5. An accurate knowledge of religious doctrines, and a simple and lucid exposition of them, no one will expect from the teachers of these times. Most of them reasoned, as blind men do

(3) Jos. Sim. *Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. ii. p. 83.

(4) See *Rich. Simon*, Lettres choisies, Tom. iv. p. 120, of the new edition.

(5) *Rich. Simon*, Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. cap. xxiv. p. 337. and Critique de la Biblioth. de M. du Pin, Tom. i. p. 226.

(6) *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothèque de M. du Pin, Tome i. p. 259.

(7) [*Bellator* was a presbyter, a friend of *Cassiodorus*, and flourished AD. 550. He wrote numerous Commentaries; viz. vi Books on Esther, v Books on Tobit, vii Books on Judith, viii Books on the Wisdom of Solomon, and x Books on the Maccabees; all of which are now lost. Tr.]

(8) See *Steph. le Moigne*, Prolegom. ad Varia Sacra, p. 53 &c. and Jo. Ab. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Graeca, Lib. v. cap. 17. or vol. vii. p. 727 &c.

about colors ; and thought they acquitted themselves nobly, when they had thrown out their crude and indigested thoughts, and overwhelmed their opposers with words. Yet among the writers of this age, may be clearly traced some indications and marks of that *threefold* manner of treating theology, which still prevails both among the Greeks and the Latins. For some collected together sentences from the ancient doctors and councils, backed by citations from the scriptures. Such was *Isidore* of Seville, among the Latins, whose *three Books of sentences* are still extant ; and among the Greeks, *Leontius* of Cyprus, whose *Loci Communes*, or Common-place-book, compiled from the works of the ancients, have been commended. From these originated that species of theology, which the Latins afterwards called *Positive Theology*. Others attempted to unfold the nature of religious doctrines, by reasoning ; which was the method generally adopted by those who disputed against the Nestorians, Eutychians, and Pelagians. These may be fitly called *Scholastics*. Others again, who believed that all divine truth must be learned by internal feeling, and by contemplation, assumed the name of *Mystics*. This threefold method of treating religious subjects, has continued down to the present day. A proper and complete system of theology, no one of this age produced ; but various parts of theology were occasionally illustrated.

§ 6. To illustrate and inculcate piety and christian duty, some gave *precepts*, while others employed *examples*. Those who gave precepts for a pious life, endeavored to form the christian character either of persons engaged in the business of active life, or of those more perfect, and removed from the contagious influence of the world. A christian life, in the former case, they represented as consisting in certain external virtues, and badges of piety ; as appears from the homilies and exhortations of *Caesarius*, the Monitory Chapters of *Agapetus*, and especially from the Summary of a virtuous life, by *Martin* of Braga.(9) In the latter case, they would separate the soul, by contemplation, from the intercourse and contagion of the body ; and therefore advised to macerate the body by watching, fasting, constant prayer, and singing of hymns ; as is manifest from *Fulgentius* on fasting, *Nicetius* on the Vigils of the servants of God, and on the advantages of Psalmody. The Greeks followed as their leader in these matters, for the most part, *Dionysius*, denominated the Areopagite ; on whom *John* of Scythopolis, during this age, published annotations. How exceedingly defective all these views were, is visible to every one, who is acquainted with the holy scriptures.

(9) See Acta Sanctor. Martii Tom. iii. p. 86 &c. [and Biblioth. Patr. Tom. x. p. 382. Tr.]

§ 7. To inculcate piety by *examples*, was the aim of all those who wrote *Lives of the Saints*. The number of these, both among the Greeks and the Latins, was very considerable. *Ennodius*, *Eugyppius*, *Cyril of Scythopolis*, *Dionysius Exiguus*, *Cogitosus*, and others are well known. Nearly all these entertain their readers with marvellous and silly fables; and propose for imitation none but delirious persons or those of perverted minds, who did violence to nature, and adopted austere and fantastic rules of life. To endure hunger and thirst without repining, to go naked about the country like mad men, to immure themselves in a narrow place, to expect to behold with their eyes closed an indescribable divine light; this was accounted holy and glorious. The less any one resembled a man of a rational and sane mind, the more confidently might he hope to obtain an honored place among the heroes and demi-gods of the church.

§ 8. In efforts to settle theological controversies, many were diligent; but none were successful. Scarcely an individual can be named, who contended against the Eutychians, the Nestorians, or the Pelagians, with fairness, sobriety, and decorum. *Primasius* and *Philoponus* treated of all the heresies: but time has swept away their works. A book of *Leontius*, on the sects, is extant; but it deserves little praise. Against the Jews, *Isidore of Seville*, and *Leontius of Neapolis*, engaged in controversy: with what dexterity, may easily be conjectured, by those who reflect on the circumstances of the age. It will be better therefore to proceed to a brief account of the controversies themselves, that disturbed the church in this century, than to treat in detail of these miserable disputants.

§ 9. Although *Origen* lay under condemnation by many public sentences and decrees, yet the attachment of numbers, and especially of the monks, to this man, scorned all limitation. In the West, one *Bellator* translated various books of *Origen* into Latin.(10) In the East, particularly in Syria and Palestine, which were the principal seats of Origenism, the monks were exceedingly zealous: and they had the approbation of certain bishops, especially of *Theodorus* of Cesarea in Cappadocia, in defending the correctness and the authority of *Origen's* sentiments.(11) The subject was brought before the emperor *Justinian*; and he issued a long and full edict, addressed to *Mennas* the bishop of Constantinople, in which he strongly condemned *Origen* and his opinions; and forbid those opinions' being

(10) [This is founded on a conjecture of *Huet*, (*Origeniana*, p. 252,) who ascribes the Latin translation of *Origen's* Homilies on Matthew, in particular, to this *Bellator*. *Schl.*]

(11) See *Cyril of Scythopolis*, *Vita Sabae*; in *Jo. Bapt. Cotclier*, *Monumenta Eccles. Graecae* p. 370 &c. and *Hen. Noris*, *Diss. de Synodo quinta*, cap. i, ii. in his *Opp.* Tom. i. p. 554.

taught.(12) The contest about the *three Chapters* commenced soon after, and Origenism not only revived in Palestine, but spread and gathered strength. These commotions were brought to a termination by the fifth [general] council, at Constantinople, assembled by *Justinian* in the year 553, when *Origen* and his adherents were again condemned.(13)

(12) This decree is extant in *Jo. Harduin*, Concilior. Tom. iii. p. 243 &c. [It was first published by *Baronius*, Annal. Eccl. ad. ann. 538; and thence passed into all the collections of Councils. Tr.]

(13) See the decree of the council, in *Jo. Harduin*, Concilior. Tom. iii. p. 283 &c. See also *Eragrius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. c. 38. and on this whole subject, see *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, Tom. i. Lib. x. c. 6. p. 517 &c. *Pet. Dan. Huet*, Origeniana, Lib. ii. p. 224. *Lud. Doucin*, Diss. subjoined to his Historia Origeniana, p. 35 &c. [*Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xviii. p. 40—58. but especially *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. vii. p. 618—760.—This contest respecting *Origen* commenced among the Palestine monks, about the year 520. One *Nonnus* with three other monks belonging to the new *Laura* (or cluster of cells), were discovered to hold and to be propagating the opinions of *Origen*. *Sabas*, abbot of the old *Laura*, and supervisor of all the Palestine monks, opposed the schismatics. They were rejected from the *Laura*; but were restored again; and in spite of opposition, and persecution, they brought over many in both *Lauras* to their views. The commotion became violent, and expulsions, fighting, and bloodshed ensued. Still it was only a contest among a few monks, living in two little societies or neighborhoods in Palestine. *Justinian's* decree addressed to *Mennas*, was probably issued about the year 540: and it has been supposed, that the council of Constantinople, which anathematized 15 errors of *Origen*, was an accidental council, held about the year 541; and not the general council held in 553. However that may be, the death of *Nonnus* in the year 546, caused the Origenist party among the monks to become divided, and to fall into a declining state. The fullest enumeration of errors held by the Origenists, which has come down to us, is that of the 15 anathemas by the council of Constantinople. Yet *Justinian's* decree, or letter to *Mennas*, is nearly as full; and it is more precise and lucid, as well as better substantiated by references to the works of *Origen*. In this decree, after a concise introduction, the emperor proceeds, like a theologian, through ten folio pages, to enumerate and confute the errors of *Origen*. He then directs the patriarch *Mennas*, to assemble what bishops and abbots could be found at Constantinople, and condemn the subjoined list of Origenian errors, their doings to be afterwards transmitted to all bishops and abbots for their confirmation; so that after this general consent shall be obtained, no bishop or abbot may be ordained, without his condemnation of Origenism as well as the other heresies. The list of errors to be condemned, is then subjoined, as follows.—(1) If any one says or believes, that human souls *preexisted*, i. e. were once mere spirits, and holy; that having become weary of divine contemplation, they were brought into a worse condition; and that, because they ἀποψυχίσας, i. e. cooled down as to the love of God, they were therefore called in Greek ψυχὰς, that is, souls; and were sent down to inhabit bodies, as a punishment; let him be anathema.—(2) If any one says or believes, that the soul of our Lord preexisted; and that it was united to God the Word, before his incarnation and birth of the virgin; let him be anathema.—(3) If any one says or believes, that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was first formed in the womb of the blessed virgin, as those of other men are; and that afterwards God the Word and the preexistent soul became united with it; let him be anathema.—(4) If any one says or believes, that God the Word was made like to all the celestial Orders, that to the Cherubim he was made a Cherub, and to the Seraphim a Seraph, and to all the celestial Virtues one like them; let him be anathema.—(5) If any one says or believes, that in the resurrection, the bodies of men will be raised orbicular, and does not confess that we shall be resuscitated erect; let him be anathema.—(6) If any one says or believes, that heaven, the sun, the moon, the stars, and the waters above the heavens, are animated, and are a sort of material Virtues; let him be anathema.—(7) If any one says or believes, that Christ the

§ 10. This controversy produced another, which was much more lasting and violent; but which, as to the subject of it, was far less important. The emperor *Justinian* burned with zeal, to extirpate the more strenuous *Monophysites*, who were called *Acephali*. On this subject he took counsel with *Theodorus* of Cesarea, who was a friend to Originism, and also a Monophysite: and he, to procure tranquillity to the Originists, by stirring a new controversy, and to fix some stigma upon the council of Chalcedon, and inflict an incurable wound on the Nestorians; persuaded the emperor to believe, that the *Acephali* would return to the church; provided the Acts of the council of Chalcedon were purged of those three passages, the *three Chapters*, in which *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, *Theodore*t bishop of Cyrus, and *Ibas* of Edessa, were acquitted of error; and provided, that certain writings of these men, favorable to the Nestorian errors, were condemned. The emperor believed this; and in the year 544, ordered those three chapters to be expunged, but without prejudice to the authority of the council of Chalcedon.(14) But this

Lord is to be crucified in the future world, for the devils, as he was in this for men; *let him be anathema*.—(8) If any one says or believes, that the power of God is *limited*; and that he created all the things he could comprehend; *let him be anathema*.—(9) If any one says or believes, that the punishment of devils and wicked men will be *temporary*, and will have an end; or that there will be a recovery and restoration of devils and wicked men; *let him be anathema*.—(10) And *Anathema to Origen*, who is called Adamantius, together with his nefarious, execrable, and abominable doctrine; and to every one who believes it, or in any manner presumes at all to defend it at any time: in Christ Jesus, our Lord, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen. *Tr.*]

(14) This decree is extant in *Jo. Harduin*, Concilior. Tom. iii. p. 287 &c. *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. c. 38. [It is called *Justinian's Creed*; and professes to define the catholic faith, as established by the 4 first general councils, those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and to condemn the opposite errors. *Dr. Mosheim's* description of the *three Chapters*, would lead us to suppose that certain chapters, sections, or paragraphs, in the *Acts of the council* of Chalcedon, were the three things condemned by *Justinian*. But this was not the fact. His decree does not *avowedly* condemn any thing contained in the Acts of that council; nor does it use the phrase *three Chapters*. The phrase was afterwards brought into use, and denoted three subjects, (capitula, κεφάλαια,) which were condemned by the decree of *Justinian*; viz. (1) the *person and writings of Theodorus*, bishop of Mopsuestia, whom the decree pronounced a heretic, and a *Nestorian*; (2) the *writings of Theodore*t bishop of Cyrus; not universally, but only so far as they favored Nestorianism, or opposed *Cyril* of Alexandria, and his 12 anathemas; and (3) an *Epistle* said to have been written by *Ibas*, bishop of Edessa, to one *Maris* a Persian, which censured *Cyril* and the first council of Ephesus, and favored the cause of Nestorius. The council of Chalcedon had passed no decree respecting *Theodorus*; and it had left all the three bishops in good standing, though the *Epistle of Ibas* and some of the writings of *Theodore*t received censure. Hence *Justinian's* decree did not openly and avowedly contravene the decisions at Chalcedon; though virtually, and in effect, it did so. To understand the contest about the *three Chapters*, it should be remembered, that the *Nestorians*, who separated the two natures of *Christ* too much, and the *Eutychians* or *Monophysites*, who commingled them too much, were the two extremes; between which the orthodox took their stand, condemning both. But the orthodox themselves did not all think alike. Some, in their zeal against the *Nestorians*, came near to the Monophysite ground; and these of

edict met with opposition from the bishops of the West and of Africa ; and especially from *Vigilius* the Roman pontiff, who maintained, that great injury was done by it, both to the council of Chalcedon, and to deceased worthies who died in the communion of the church.(15) *Justinian* summoned *Vigilius* to Constantinople, and compelled him to condemn the *three Chapters*. But the African and Illirian bishops, on the other hand, compelled *Vigilius* to revoke that condemnation. For no one of them would own him for a bishop and a brother, until he had approved those three chapters. *Iustinian* again condemned the three chapters, by a new edict, in the year 551.

§ 11. After various contentions, it was thought best, to refer the controversy to the decision of a general council. *Justinian* therefore, in the year 553, assembled at Constantinople, what is called, the *fifth general council*. In this council, the opinions of *Origen*,(16) as well as the three Chalcedonian *Chapters*, according to the wishes of the emperor, were judged to be pernicious to the church ; yet it was a decision of the eastern bishops, for very few from the West were present. *Vigilius*, then at Constantinople, would not assent to the decrees of this council. He was therefore treated indignantly by the emperor, and sent into banishment ; nor was he allowed to return, till he acceded to the

course felt willing to condemn the three Chapters. Others, zealous only against the Monophysites, were not far from being Nestorians ; and these of course defended the three Chapters ; for *Theodorus*, *Theodoret*, and *Ibas* had been leading men of this very character. Hence the interest shown by the oriental bishops, in this controversy. But in the West, where the Nestorian and Eutychian contests had been less severe, and where the persons and writings of *Theodorus*, *Ibas* and *Theodoret* were little known ; the *three Chapters* were felt to be of little consequence ; except as the condemning them seemed to impair the authority of the decrees of Chalcedon, and to asperse characters once held venerable in the church.—It was doubtless a most rash thing, in *Justinian*, to condemn the three Chapters. But having done it, he resolved to persevere in it. The church was agitated long, and severely : and at length, this precipitate act of the emperor, being sanctioned by the requisite authority, had the effect to shape the creed of the catholic church, from that day to this. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii. p. 3—468, but especially p. 437 &c. Tr.]

(15) *Hen. Noris*, de Synodo quinta, cap. x &c. Opp. Tom. i. p. 579. *Ja. Bagnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, Tom. i. L. x. c. vi. pa. 523 &c. [also *Dr. Walch*, ubi supra.]

(16) [According to the acts of this council, as they have come down to us, *Origen* was no otherwise condemned by this general council, than by having his name inserted in the list of heretics, collectively anathematized in the 11th anathema.—The celebrated 15 anathemas of as many Origenian errors, said to have been decreed by this council, are found in no copy of its Acts ; nor are they mentioned by any ancient writer. *Peter Lambecius* first discovered them in the imperial library at Vienna, in an old MS. of *Photius*' *Syntagma Canonum*, bearing the superscription, "Canons of the 165 holy Fathers of the fifth holy council at Constantinople ;" and published them with a Latin translation ; whence *Baluze* first introduced them into the Collections of Councils. But *Cave*, *Walch*, *Valesius* and others, suppose they were framed in a council at Constantinople, about AD. 541. See note (13) above, p. 485 ; *Cave*, *Hist. Lit.* Tom. i. p. 558 : *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vii. p. 644, 761 : *Valesius*, note on *Eragrius*, H. E. Lib. iv. c. 38. Tr.]

decrees of this 5th council.(17) *Pelagius*, his successor, and the subsequent Roman pontiffs, in like manner, received those decrees. But neither *their* authority, nor that of the emperors, could prevail with the western bishops to follow their example. For many of them, on this account, seceded from communion with the Roman pontiff; nor could this great wound be healed, except by length of time.(18)

§ 12. Another considerable controversy broke out among the Greeks, in the year 519; namely, *whether it could properly be said, that one of the Trinity was crucified*. Many adopted this language, in order to press harder upon the *Nestorians*, who separated the natures of *Christ* too much. Among these were the Scythian monks at Constantinople, who were the principal movers of this controversy. But others regarded this language as allied to the error of the *Theopaschites* or Eutychians; and therefore rejected it. With these, *Hormisdas* bishop of Rome, when consulted by the Scythian monks, coincided; and great and pernicious altercations ensued. Afterwards, the fifth council, and *John II*, a successor of *Hormisdas*, by approving of this language, restored peace to the church.(19) Connected with this question was another; *whether it was proper to say, Christ's person was compounded*: which the Scythian monks affirmed, and others denied.

(17) See *Peter de Marca*, Diss. de decreto Vigilii pro confirmatione Synodi quintae; among the Diss. subjoined to his work, de Concordia sacerdotii et imperii, p. 207 &c. [and *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, (*Vigilius*), vol. ii. p. 382—413, ed. Lond. 1750. Tr.]

(18) See in preference to all others, *Hen. Noris*, de Synodo quinta Oecumenica; yet *Noris* is not free from partiality. Also *Christ. Lupus*, Notes on the 5th Council, among his Adnotat. ad Concilia.

(19) See *Hen. Noris*, Historia controversiae de uno ex trinitate passo; Opp. Tom. iii. p. 771. The ancient writers who mention this controversy, call the monks with whom it originated, *Scythians*. But *Matur. Veiss. la Croze*, Thesaur. Epistolar. Tom. iii. p. 189, conjectures, that they were *Scetic* monks from Egypt, and not *Scythians*. This conjecture has some probability. [But *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. vii. p. 296, 297, says of this conjecture: "it is not only improbable, but is certainly false." And the documents relative to the controversy, (of which he had there just closed the recital,) do appear, as *Dr. Walch* affirms; "adequate to prove, that these men were really from Scythia." Together with the two modes of expression relative to the Trinity, which they advocated, these monks were strenuous opposers of *Pelagianism*. Having had disagreement with some bishops of their province, particularly with *Paternus*, bishop of *Tomis*, a deputation of them went to Constantinople with their complaint. Among these deputies, *John Maxentius*, *Leontius*, and *Achilles*, were the principal. The emperor rather favored them; but the bishops of the East were not agreed. The emperor obliged the pope's legates at the court to hear the cause. But they were not disposed to decide it; at least, not as the monks wished. A part of them now repaired to Rome, where they stayed more than a year. *Hormisdas* disapproved their phraseology, but was not very ready to condemn it outright. While at Rome, these monks wrote to the exiled African bishops in Sardinia, and by taking part in *their* controversy, obtained their friendship. They certainly had many friends; but the ancient historians have transmitted to us only some slight notices of their history. See *Walch*, Hist. der Ketzereyen, vol. vii. p. 262—313. *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, (*Hormisdas*) Vol. ii. p. 306—309. Tr.]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied.—§ 2. Explanations of the ceremonies.—§ 3. Public worship. The Eucharist. Baptism —§ 4. Temples. Festivals.

§ 1. In proportion as true religion and piety, from various causes, declined in this century, the external signs of religion and piety, that is, rites and ceremonies, were augmented. In the East, the Nestorian and Eutychian contests occasioned the invention of various rites and forms, which might serve as marks to distinguish the contending sects. In the West, *Gregory* the Great was wonderfully dexterous and ingenious in devising and recommending new ceremonies. Nor will this appear strange, to those who are aware, that he was of the opinion, that the words of the holy scriptures were *images* of recondite things. For whoever can believe this, can easily bring himself to inculcate all the doctrines and precepts of religion, by means of rites and signs. Yet in one respect, he is to be commended; namely, that he would not obtrude his ceremonies upon others:—perhaps he would not, because he *could* not.

§ 2. This multitude of ceremonies required interpreters. Hence a new kind of science arose, both in the East and in the West, the object of which was, to investigate and explain the grounds and reasons of the sacred rites. But most of those who deduce these rites from scripture and reason, betray folly, and exhibit rather the fictions of their own brains than the true causes of things. If they had been acquainted with ancient opinions and customs, and had examined the pontifical laws of the Greeks and Romans, they would have taught much more correctly; for from this source were derived many of the rites, which the christians regarded as sacred.

§ 3. The public worship of God was still celebrated, in the vernacular language of each nation; but it was here and there more enlarged, by various hymns and other circumstantial things. The new mode of administering the *Lord's supper*, magnificently, and with a splendid apparatus, or the *Canon of the Mass*, as it is called, was a prescription of *Gregory* the Great; or, if it will be more satisfactory, he enlarged and altered the old *Canon*. But many ages elapsed, before the other Latin churches could be prevailed on to adopt this Romish form.(1) *Baptism*, except in

(1) See *Theod. Chr. Lilienthal, de Canone Missae Gregoriano, Lugd. Bat. 1740.*
VOL. I.

cases of necessity, was conferred only on the feast days ; and those also the greater festivals, or those of the highest class.(2) As to the *Litanies* to the Saints, as they are called,(3) the various kinds of worshipping assemblies, and the *stations* of Gregory,(4) the formulas of *consecration*, and other rites invented in this century, to captivate the senses with a shew of religion ; we shall pass over them, to avoid prolixity. This subject requires the labors and investigations of a special treatise.

§ 4. The temples erected in memory and to the honor of the saints, were immensely numerous, both in the East and the West.(5) There had long been houses enough erected, to accommodate the people with places of worship ; but this age courted the favor of departed saints, with these edifices, as a kind of presents ; nor did they doubt at all, that these saints took under their immediate protection and care, the provinces, cities, towns, and villages, in which they saw such residences prepared for them.(6) The number of feast days almost equalled that of the churches. In particular, the list of festivals for the whole christian church, was swelled, by the consecration of the day of the *purification of the holy virgin Mary*, that the people might not miss

Svo. and the writers on Liturgies. [Different countries had different Missals. Not only the East differed from the West, but in both there were diversities. In *Gaul*, the old Liturgy continued till the time of *Charlemagne*. In *Milan*, the Ambrosian Liturgy, (so named from *St. Ambrose*, bishop of Milan,) is not yet wholly abandoned. In *Spain*, the Mosarabic or ancient Spanish, is still used occasionally in certain places, though the Roman canon was introduced partially in the 11th, and more fully in the 13th and following centuries. In *England*, the ancient Britons had one Liturgy ; and the Anglo-Saxons received another, from *Augustine* their apostle, and his companions ; and this not precisely the Roman. See *Krazer*, de Liturgiis, Sec. ii. chap. 2—6. *Gregory* the Great introduced the responsive chant ; and established a school for church music, which was in existence at Rome as late as the 9th century. Tr.]

(2) [Especially Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Whitsuntide, and St. John the Baptist ; at least in Gaul. See *Gregory* of Tours, de Gloria Confessor. c. 69, 76. and, *Historia Francor.* Lib. viii. c. 9. Schl.]

(3) [The *Litanies*, of which there were the larger and the smaller, the common and the special, were, in the previous centuries, addressed only to God ; but superstition now led men to address them to *Mary*, and to the other saints. Von Ein.]

(4) [*Stations* denoted, in early times, *fasts* ; but afterwards, the *churches*, *chapels*, *cemeteries*, or other places, where the people assembled for worship. (See *du Cange*, Glossar. Med. and Infim. Latinit. sub hac voce.) *Gregory* discriminated the different times, occasions, and places of public worship ; and framed a service for each. This is the principal cause of the vast multiplication of liturgical formulas in the Romish church. Tr.]

(5) [See *Procopius*, de Bello Gothico, Lib. iv, and v. also, de Aedificiis Justiniani ; where is mention of many churches erected to the virgin *Mary*. Schl.]

(6) [Thus, the Lombard queen, *Theodelinda*, built a church for *John the Baptist* ; that he might pray for her and her people. (*Paul Diacon.* Hist. Longobard. L. iv. c. 7.) And the French king, *Clothaire*, built a splendid temple to *St. Vincent* ; because he believed that saint had helped him to vanquish the Goths. (*Siegbert*, Chronic.) For the same reason, rich presents were made to the churches. Thus *Childebert*, after conquering *Alarick*, gave to the church sixty cups, fifteen dishes, and twenty cases for the holy Gospels ; all of the finest gold, and set with costly gems. (*Gregory* of Tours, *Historia Francor.* L. iii. c. 10. Schl.]

their *Lupercalia*, which they were accustomed to celebrate in the month of February,(7)—and by the day of the *Savior's conception*,(8) the birth day of *St. John*,(9) and some others.

(7) [This was instituted in the reign of *Justinian*, and fixed to the 2d day of February. The Greeks called it ὑπαντή or ὑπαπαντή, *meeting*; because then *Simeon* and *Anna* met the Savior in the Temple. The Latins call it the *feast of St. Simeon*, the *presentation of the Lord*, and *Candlemass*; because many candles were then lighted up; as had been done on the *Lupercalia*, the festival of the ravishment of *Proserpine*, whom her mother *Ceres* searched for with candles. See *Hospinian*, de Festis Christianor. p. 52 &c. Tr.]

(8) [This feast, is generally celebrated the 25th of March; and is called by the Greeks ἡμέρα ἀσπασμῶν, sive εὐαγγελισμῶν, the *day of the salutation*, or of the *annunciation*; because on it, the angel *Gabriel* announced to *Mary* that she should bring forth the Savior. The Latins absurdly call it, the *annunciation of Mary*. To avoid interrupting the Lent fast, the Spaniards celebrated it on the 18th of December, and the Armenians on the 5th of January; the other churches kept it the 25th of March. It is mentioned in the 52d canon of the council in Trullo, AD. 691, as a festival then fully established and known; but at what time it was first introduced is uncertain. See *Suicer*, Thesaur. Eccles. Tom. i. p. 1234. Tr.]

(9) [I know not what induced *Dr. Mosheim* to place the introduction of this feast in this century. If the superscriptions to the homilies of *Maximus* of Turin, (who lived AD. 420,) are correct, this feast must have been common in the 5th century; for three of these homilies are superscribed, as being composed for this feast. Perhaps *Dr. Mosheim* had his eye on the 21st canon of the council held at Agde AD. 506, (*Hurduin's Collection*, Tom. ii. p. 1000,) where the festival of *St. John* is mentioned among the greater feasts. Yet as it is there mentioned as one already known, it must have been in existence some years. Moreover heathenish rites were mixed with this feast. The feast of *St. John*, and the dancing around a tree set up, were usages, as well of the German and northern nations, as of the Romans. The former had their *Noodfyr*, (on which *Joh. Reiske* published a book, Francf. 1696, 8vo.) and the latter used, about this time, [the 24th of June,] to keep the feast of *Vesta*, with kindling a new fire, amid dances and other sports. Schl.]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES AND SEPARATIONS FROM THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the ancient sects. Manichaeans. Pelagians.—§ 2. Donatists.—
§ 3. Arians.—§ 4. State of the Nestorians.—§ 5. Eutychian contests. Severus.—§ 6. Jac. Baradaeus, the father of the Monophysites.—§ 7. Their state.—
§ 8. Controversies among them.—§ 9. The Agnoetae.—§ 10. Tritheists.

§ 1. The ancient sects, though harassed in numberless ways, did not cease to raise dangerous commotions, in various places. Among the Persians, the Manichaeans are said to have become so powerful as to seduce the son of *Cabades* the monarch: but he avenged the crime, by making a great slaughter of them. They must also have been troublesome in other countries; for *Heraclianus* of Chalcedon, deemed it important, to write a book against them.(1) In Gaul and Africa, the contests between the Semi-Pelagians and the followers of *Augustine* continued.

§ 2. The Donatists were comfortably situated, so long as the Vandals reigned in Africa. But they were less favored, when this kingdom was overturned, in the year 534. Yet they not only kept up their church, but near the close of the century, or from the year 591, ventured to defend it with more courage, and to extend its influence. These efforts of theirs were vigorously opposed, by *Gregory* the Great; who, as appears from his Epistles,(2) endeavored in various ways, to depress the sect now raising its head again. And his measures doubtless were successful; for the Donatist church became extinct in this century; at least, no mention is made of it after this time.

§ 3. The Arians, at the commencement of this century, were triumphant in some parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Not a few of the Asiatic bishops favored them. The Vandals in Africa, the Goths in Italy, many of the Gauls, the Suevi, the Burgundians, and the Spaniards, openly espoused their interest. The Greeks indeed, who approved of the Nicene council, oppressed and also punished them, wherever they were able; but the Arians returned the like treatment, especially in Africa and Italy.(3)

(1) See *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. cxiv. p. 291.

(2) See his Epistolar. Lib. iv. Ep. 34, 35. p. 714, 715. and Lib. vi. Ep. 65. p. 841. Ep. 37. p. 821. and Lib. ix. Ep. 53. p. 972. and Lib. ii. Ep. 48. p. 611. Opp. Tom. ii. [The emperor *Mauricius* issued penal laws against them, in the year 595. It is a probable conjecture of *Witsius*, (*Historia Donatist.* cap. viii. § 9.) that the conquest of the Saracens in Africa, in the 7th century, put an end to the Donatist contest. *Schl.*]

(3) *Procopius*, de Bello Vandal. L. i. c. 8. and de Bello Gothico, Lib. i. c. 2. *Evagrius*, *Historia Eccles.* L. iv. cap. 15 &c.

Yet this prosperity of the Arians wholly terminated, when, under the auspices of *Justinian*, the Vandals were driven from Africa, and the Goths from Italy.(4) For the other Arian kings, *Sigismund* king of the Burgundians, *Theodimir* king of the Suevi in Lusitania, and *Reccared* king of Spain, without violence and war, suffered themselves to be led to a renunciation of the Arian doctrine, and to efforts for its extirpation among their subjects by means of legal enactments and councils. Whether reason and arguments, or hope and fear, had the greater influence in the conversion of these kings, it is difficult to say.(5) But this is certain, the Arian sect was from this time dispersed, and could never after recover any strength.

§ 4. The Nestorians, after they had obtained a fixed residence in Persia, and had located the head of their sect at Seleucia, were as successful as they were industrious, in disseminating their doctrines in the countries lying without the Roman empire. It appears from unquestionable documents still existing, that there were numerous societies in all parts of Persia, in India, in Armenia, in Arabia, in Syria, and in other countries, under the jurisdiction of the *patriarch* of Seleucia, during this century.(6) The Persian kings were not, indeed, all equally well affected towards this sect ; and they sometimes severely persecuted all christians resident in their dominions :(7) yet generally they shewed a marked preference for the Nestorians, before the adherents to the council of Ephesus : for they suspected the latter to be spies, sent among them by the Greeks, with whom they agreed as to religion.

§ 5. The sect of the *Monophysites* was no less favorably situated ; and it drew over to its side a great part of the East. In the first place, the emperor *Anastasius*, [AD. 491—518,] was attached to the sect and to the dogmas of the *Acephali*, or more rigid *Monophysites* ;(8) and he did not hesitate, on the removal

(4) See *Joh. Ja. Mascovii* Historia Germanor. Tom. ii. the subversion of the Vandalic kingdom, p. 76, of that of the Goths, p. 91. On the accession of the barbarians to the Nicene faith respecting God, see *Acta Sanctor.* Tom. ii. Martii p. 275, and Tom. ii. Aprilis, p. 134.

(5) [The latter is to me the most probable. The kings of these nations were very ignorant ; and made war rather than science their trade. Among such a people, conviction of the understanding is little to be expected. Arguments of expediency would have more effect. They were surrounded by orthodox christians, who would deprive them of their territories, on the ground that they were heretics. If therefore they would enjoy peace and quietude, they must make up their minds to embrace the Nicene faith. Many of these conversions also were brought about by ladies ; for instance, the conversion of *Hermengild*, a West Gothic prince, by his French wife *Ingunda*. Schl.]

(6) *Cosmas* Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, Lib. ii. p. 125 : in *Bern. de Montfaucon*, *Collectio nova Patrum Graecor.* of which, the Preface p. xi &c. is worth reading.

(7) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* Tom. iii. P. i. p. 109, 407, 411, 441, 449, and Tom. iii. P. ii. cap. v. § 2. p. lxxiii. &c.

(8) *Eragrius*, *Histor. Eccles.* Lib. iii. c. 30, 44 &c. *Theodorus Lector*, *Histo-*

of *Flavianus* from the chair of Antioch, in 513, to elevate to that see *Severus*, a learned monk of Palestine, who was devoted to that sect, and from whom the *Monophysites* had the name of *Severians*.(9) This man exerted all his powers, to destroy the credit of the council of Chalcedon in the East, and to strengthen the party which professed but *one nature* in Christ: and his zealous efforts produced most grievous commotions.(10) But the emperor *Anastasius* dying in the year 518, *Severus* was expelled from his see; and the sect, which he had so zealously propagated, was restrained and depressed by *Justin* and the succeeding emperors, to such a degree, that it seemed very near being ruined; yet it elected *Sergius* for its patriarch, in place of *Severus*.(11)

§ 6. When the Monophysites were nearly in despair, and very few of their bishops remained, some of them being dead, and others in captivity; an obscure man, *Jacobus*, surnamed *Baradaeus*, or *Zanzalus*, to distinguish him from others of the name, restored their fallen state.(12) This indigent monk, a most indefatigable and persevering man, being ordained bishop, by a few bishops who were confined in prison, travelled over all the East,

ria Eccles. Lib. ii. p. 562. A catalogue of the Works of *Severus*, collected from MS. copies, is in *Bernh. de Montfaucon's* Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 53 &c. [According to *Evagrius*, loc. cit. *Anastasius* was not zealous for any party; but was a great lover of peace, and determined neither to make, nor to suffer, any change in the ecclesiastical constitution; that is, he adhered to the *Henoticon* of *Zeno* his predecessor. This was taking the *middle ground*; for the more strenuous *Monophysites* rejected the *Henoticon*, and insisted on an explicit condemnation of the council of Chalcedon; while the more rigid catholics, who also disliked the *Henoticon*, were for holding fast every tittle of the decisions of Chalcedon. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. vi. p. 930, 946, 947, 948. Tr.]

(9) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. ii. p. 47, 321 &c. *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor. p. 127, 128, 130, 135, 138 &c. [See a notice of *Severus*, above, ch. ii. Note (28) p. 470, 471. Tr.]

(10) *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 33. *Cyrillus*, Vita Sabae, in *Joh. Bapt. Cotelier's* Monumenta Eccles. Graecae, Tom. iii. p. 312. Nouveau Dictionnaire histor. critique, Tom. i. Art. *Anastasius*. [There is some ambiguity in *Dr. Mosheim's* statement. Who was *this man*, that exerted all his powers against the council of Chalcedon? *Dr. Maclaine* understood *Mosheim* to refer to the emperor *Anastasius*. But other translators preserve the ambiguity. Historical facts shew, that it was *Severus*, rather than *Anastasius*, who persecuted the Chalcedonians. See *Evagrius*, as referred to above. Lib. iii. c. 33. Tr.]

(11) See *Abulpharaji*, Series Patriarch. Antiochen. in *Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. ii. p. 323. [For a full and minute examination of the Monophysite history, see *Walch's* Historie der Ketzereyen; namely, during the reign of *Anastasius*, vol. vi. p. 936—1054; under *Justin*, vol. vii. p. 52—128; and under *Justinian*, ibid. p. 128—362. Tr.]

(12) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana, Tom. ii. cap. viii. p. 62, 72, 326, 331, 414 &c. *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor. p. 119, 133, 425 &c. and Liturgiae Oriental. Tom. ii. p. 333, 342. *Faustus Nairon*, Euoplia fidei Catholicae ex Syrorum monumentis, P. i. p. 40, 41. [*Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. viii. p. 481—490. *Jacobus Baradacus* was a Syrian monk, and a pupil of *Severus*, archbishop of Antioch. His ordination is placed by some, in the year 545, by others in 551. His death, all place in the year 578. Some call him bishop of Edessa; others make him to have been bishop at large. The number of bishops, priests, and deacons ordained by him, is reported to be

on foot, constituted a vast number of bishops and presbyters, revived every where the depressed spirits of the Monophysites, and was so efficient, by his eloquence, and his astonishing diligence, that when he died, in the year 578, at Edessa where he had been bishop, he left his sect in a very flourishing state, in Syria, in Mesopotamia, in Armenia, in Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia, and in other countries.(13) He extinguished nearly all the dissensions among the Monophysites: and as their churches were so widely dispersed in the East, that the bishop of Antioch could not well govern them all, he associated with him a *Maphrian* or *primate* of the East, whose residence was at *Tagritum*, on the borders of Armenia.(14) His efforts were not a little aided, in Egypt and the neighboring regions, by *Theodosius* of Alexandria. From this man, as the second father of the sect, all the Monophysites in the East, are called *Jacobites*.

§ 7. Thus the imprudence of the Greeks, and their inconsiderate zeal for maintaining the truth, caused the Monophysites to become consolidated into a permanent body. From this period, the whole community has been under the government of two bishops or *patriarchs*, one of Alexandria, and the other of Antioch, who, notwithstanding the Syrians and Egyptians disagree in some particulars, are very careful to maintain communion with each other, by letters and by kind offices. Under the patriarch of Alexandria, is the *primate* or *Abbuna* of the Abyssinians; and under the patriarch of Antioch, stands the *Maphrian* or *primate* of the East, whose residence is at Tagritum in Mesopotamia. The Armenians have their own bishop, and are distinguished from the other Monophysites, by some peculiar rites and opinions.

(8) Before the sect of the Monophysites had acquired this strength and consistency, various disagreements and controversies prevailed among them; and particularly at Alexandria a difficult, knotty question was moved, concerning the body of Christ. *Julian* of Halicarnassus,(15) in the year 519, maintained that the divine nature had so insinuated itself into the body of *Christ*, from the very moment of his conception, that this body changed its nature, and became *incorruptible*. With him agreed *Cajanus* [or Ga-

100,000. That he put an end to the divisions and contests among the Monophysites, as *Dr Mosheim* asserts, is not stated in any of the authorities quoted by *Walch*. As the Monophysites, all over the East, are to this day called *Jacobites*, from this *Jacobus Baradaeus*; so the orthodox Greeks are called *Melchites*, from the Syriac, *Melcha*, a king, as being adherents to the religion of the imperial court. Tr.]

(13) For the Nubians and Abyssinians, see *Asseman*, loc. cit. Tom. ii. p. 330. *Hieron. Lobo*, Voyage d'Abissinie, Tom. ii. p. 36. *Job Ludolph*, Comment. ad Historiam Aethiop. p. 451, 461, 466. For the other countries, see the writers of their history.

(14) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. Tom. ii. p. 410, 414, 418. likewise his Dissert. de Monophysitis, prefixed to Tom. ii. of this Bibliotheca.

(15) [*Julian* is noticed among the writers of the century, above, pa. 470, note (28) Tr.]

janus] of Alexandria; from whom the believers in this sentiment were called *Cajanists*.(16) The advocates of this doctrine became divided into three parties; two of which disagreed on the question, whether *Christ's* body was *created* or *uncreated*; and the third maintained, that *Christ's* body was indeed corruptible, but on account of the influence of the divine nature, never became in fact corrupted. This sect was vigorously resisted by the celebrated *Severus* of Antioch, and *Damianes*; who maintained that the body of Christ, before his resurrection, was *corruptible*, that is, was liable to all the changes to which human bodies in general are. Those who agreed with *Julian*, were called *Aphthartodocetae*, *Docetae*, *Phantasiastae*, and also *Manichaeans*; because, from their opinion it might be inferred, that *Christ* did not *really* suffer, feel hungry, fall asleep, and experience the other sensations of a man; but that he only *appeared* to suffer, to sleep, to be hungry, thirsty &c. Those who agreed with *Severus*, were called *Phthartolatrae*, and *Ktistolatrae* or *Creaticolae*. This controversy was agitated with great warmth, in the reign of *Justinian*, who favored the *Aphthartodocetae*: but it afterwards gradually subsided.(17) A middle path between the two parties, was taken by *Xenaias*, or *Philoxenus* of Maubug [or Hierapolis]; for he and his associates held, that *Christ* really suffered the ordinary sensations of a man; but that in him this was not the effect of nature, but of choice.(18)

§ 9. Some of the *Corrupticolae*, as they were called, particularly *Themistius*, a deacon of Alexandria, and *Theodosius*, bishop of that city, in the ardor of disputation, fell upon another sentiment, towards the close of this century,(19) which caused new commotions. They affirmed that, while all things were known by the *divine* nature of Christ, to his *human* nature which was united with it, many things were unknown. As they held to but one nature in Christ, [or were *Monophysites*,] others put the construction upon their doctrine, that they made the divine nature to participate in this ignorance: and hence they were called

(16) [*Gajanus* was archdeacon of Alexandria, under the patriarch *Timotheus III*: and on his death, in the year 534, elected patriarch of Alexandria, by the monks, and the populace, in opposition to *Theodosius*, the bishop of the court party. Great commotions now existed in Alexandria; and *Gainus* was soon deposed. He fled first to Carthage, and then to Sardinia; and we hear little more about him. It is not known that he wrote any thing. See *Liberatus*, Breviar. cap. 20. and *Leontius*, de Sectis, Art. v. Tr.]

(17) *Timotheus*, de Receptione haereticor. in *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's Monumenta Ecclesiae Gr.* Tom. iii. p. 409. *Liberatus*, Breviarium, Controv. cap. 20. *Jo. Forbes*, Instructiones historico-theologicae, Lib. iii. c. 18, 108 &c. *Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Tom. iii. P. ii. p. 457. [The contests respecting the *corruptibility* of Christ's body, both among the Monophysites and the orthodox, are fully examined, in *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. viii. p. 550—644. Tr.]

(18) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. Tom. ii. p. 22. and p. 168 &c.

(19) [This controversy began, before the middle of the century; for *Themistius* was a deacon, under *Timotheus III*, who died in the year 535. *Theodosius*

Agnoëtae.(20) But this new sect was feeble; and therefore it declined and became extinct, sooner than might have been anticipated, from the animated eloquence of the disputants.

§ 10. From the controversies with the Monophysites, arose the sect of the *Tritheists*. Its author was one *John Ascunage*, a Syrian philosopher, and a Monophysite.(21) This man imagined there were in God, three numerically distinct natures, or subsistencies, all perfectly alike, and connected by no common vinculum of *essence*: from which dogma, his adversaries deduced *Tritheism*. Among the patrons of this opinion, no one was more celebrated than *John Philoponus*, a grammarian and philosopher of great fame at Alexandria: and hence he has by many been accounted the founder of the sect; and the members of it have been called *Philoponists*.(22) As the sect advanced, it became divided into two parties, the *Philoponists* and the *Cononites*; the latter so named from its leader, *Conon* bishop of *Tarsus*.(23)

succeeded in that year; but was removed about AD. 537. The heat of the controversy seems to have been, about AD. 550 or 560; yet it was rife in the time of *Gregory* the Great, and the sect existed till some time in the seventh century *Tr.*

(20) *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier*, in the *Monumenta Ecclesiae Gr.* Tom. iii. p. 641. *Mich. le Quien*, on *Damascenus* de *Haeresibus*, Tom. i. p. 107. *Jo. Forbes*, *Instructiones historico-theol.* Lib. iii. cap. 19. p. 119. *Photius*, *Biblioth. Codex cccxxx.* p. 882. [*Walch* has given a full and satisfactory account of the *Agnoëtae* or *Themistian*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii. p. 644—684. It appears, that the *Agnoëtae* merely denied that the human nature of Christ became omniscient, by being united with the divine nature;—a doctrine which few at this day will condemn. Nor did their contemporaries in general, understand them to go farther. But the writers of the middle ages, represent them as denying, altogether, the omniscience of Christ; and many of the moderns till quite recently, had similar views of this sect. See *Walch*, loc. cit. p. 675—679. *Tr.*]

(21) See *Gregory Abulpharajus*, in *Jos. Sim. Asseman's Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* Tom. i. p. 328 &c. [This is the only ancient writer that mentions this *John Ascunage*; and his statement is, that this *John* was a disciple of *Samuel Peter*, a Syrian philosopher who taught philosophy 20 years at Constantinople; that *John* succeeded him in the school; but having advanced his new doctrine, he was banished by the emperor *Justinian*. *Tr.*]

(22) See *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr. Lib. v. c. 37.* Tom. ix. p. 358. *Jo. Harduin*, *Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 1288. *Timotheus*, de *Receptione Haereticor.* in *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's Monumenta Ecclesiae Gr.* Tom. iii. p. 414. *John Damascenus*, de *Haeresibus*, Opp. Tom. i. p. 103. ed. *le Quien*. [*John Philoponus* was born, and probably spent his life, at Alexandria. He was a literary layman, and deeply read in the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy. Yet he was a christian; and a Monophysite, as most of the Alexandrians in his day were. The time of his birth and death is unknown: but it appears, that he was a writer from about AD. 560, till several years into the 7th century. Whether his own reflections or the books of *John Ascunage* first led him to his Tritheism, is uncertain. His works now extant are, a Book on the *Hexaëmeron*; another, on *Easter*; one against *Proclus*, to prove the world not eternal; a Book on the *Gr. dialects*; and *Commentaries* on various works of *Aristotle*. His lost works were, on the *Resurrection*; against the council of *Chalcedon*; against the sentiments of *John* archbishop of Constantinople, respecting the Trinity; against *Jamblichus* de *Simulacris*; against *Severus*; and a Book on *Union*, entitled *Διαίτησις* sive *Arbiter*; a valuable extract from which is preserved. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litterar.* Tom. i. p. 267. and *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii. p. 702 &c. *Tr.*]

(23) *Photius*, *Biblioth. Codex xxiv.* *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* Tom. ii. p. 329 &c.

These parties agreed respecting the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, but were at variance respecting the explanation of the doctrine concerning the *resurrection* of our bodies. For *Philoponus* maintained, that both the *matter* and the *form* of all bodies were generated, and corruptible; and therefore, that both would be resuscitated at the resurrection: but *Conon* held, that the *matter*, only, and not the form, of bodies was corruptible and to be resuscitated.(24) To both these stood opposed, the *Damianists*; so named from *Damianus*, [the Monophysite patriarch] of Alexandria. These discriminated between the divine *essence* and the three *Persons*, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In other words, they denied that each Person, by himself and in nature, was God; but maintained, that the three Persons had a *common God or divinity*, by an undivided participation of which, each one was God. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they denominated *Hypostases*, [or *Persons*]; and what was common to them, *God*, *substance*, and *nature*.(25)

(24) [For a full account of the disagreement between the *Cononites* and the other *Philoponists*, respecting the resurrection of the body, see *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii. p. 762—778. *Tr.*]

(25) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* Tom. ii. p. 78, 332 &c. [The controversies respecting the Trinity in unity, which are the subject of this section, are minutely investigated by *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii. p. 685—762. He concludes, that *Philoponus* and his sect were really, though perhaps unconsciously, *Tritheists*: for *Philoponus* held to a merely *specific unity* in God, and not to a *numerical unity*; that is, he taught that the three persons in the Trinity had a *common nature*, in the same sense that *Paul* and *Peter* had a common nature, and as all the angels have a common nature. (*Walch*, l. c. p. 728 &c.) The *Damianists*, on the contrary, rejecting the idea of a mere *specific unity* in God, held the three divine persons to be *numerically one*, except as distinguished by *certain characteristic marks*: so that he was really on Sabellian ground. (*Walch*, loc. cit. p. 753—757.) See also *Münscher's Dogmengeschichte* vol. iii. p. 512—516. ed. Marp. 1818. *Tr.*]

CENTURY SEVENTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPERITY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Christianity propagated in China.—§ 2. The English converted.—§ 3. Also the Gauls, Suevi, Frieslanders, Franks, and Helvetii.—§ 4. Judgment concerning these apostles.—§ 5. Jews compelled to embrace christianity.

§ 1. The christian religion was, in this century, diffused beyond its former bounds, both in the eastern and western countries. In the East, the Nestorians, with incredible industry and perseverance, labored to propagate it from Persia, Syria, and India, among the barbarous and savage nations inhabiting the deserts and the remotest shores of Asia: and that their zeal was not inefficient, appears from numerous proofs still existing. In particular, the vast empire of China was enlightened, by this zeal and industry, with the light of christianity. Those who regard as genuine and authentic, that *Chinese monument of Sigan*, which was discovered in the seventeenth century, believe that christianity was introduced into China, in the year 636, when *Jesujabas* of Gadala presided over the Nestorian community.(1) And

(1) This celebrated monument has been published and explained, by several persons; in particular, by *Athan. Kircher*, *China illustrata*, p. 53. *Andr. Müller*, in a distinct treatise, Berlin 1672. 4to. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Relations anciennes des Indes et de la Chine, de deux Voyageurs Mahometans*, p. 228—271. Paris 1718. 8vo. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, Tom. iii. Pt. ii. c. iv. § 7. pa. 538 &c. A more accurate copy, with notes, was expected from the very learned *Theoph. Sigefr. Bayer*, much distinguished for his knowledge of Chinese literature. But his premature death frustrated the expectation. I see no reason, why I should not regard this monument as genuine; nor can I conceive, what advantage the Jesuits could have promised themselves, from a fabrication of this sort. See *Gabr. Liron*, *Singularités histor. et littéraires*, Tome ii. p. 500 &c. [See also *Tho. Yeates*, *Indian church history*, p. 85—96. Lond. 1818. 8vo. *Kircher's* translation of the inscription, with a comment and some notes, is given in the Appendix to *Mosheim's Historia Eccles Tartarorum*, p. 2—28. The

those who look upon this as a fabrication of the Jesuits, may be fully satisfied by other and unexceptionable proofs, that China, especially the northern part of it, contained in this century, or perhaps even earlier, numerous christians, over whom presided, during several subsequent centuries, a *metropolitan*, sent out by the patriarch of the Chaldeans or Nestorians.(2)

§ 2. The attention of the Greeks was so engrossed with their intestine dissensions, that they were little solicitous about the propagation of christianity among the heathen.(3) In the West, among the Anglo-Saxons, *Augustine*, till his death in 605, and afterwards, other monks sent from Rome, labored to extend and enlarge the church. And the result of their labors and efforts was, that the other six Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto continued in paganism, gradually came over to the side of christianity, and all Britain became professedly christian.(4) Yet we

monument is said to be a marble slab, ten feet long, and five broad; dug up in the year 1625, at a town near *Si-ngan-fu*, capital of the province *Shen-si*. The top of the slab is a pyramidal cross. The caption to the inscription consists of nine Chinese words, formed into a square; and is thus translated: "This stone was erected to the honor and eternal memory of the Law of Light and Truth brought from *Ta-cin*, [*Judea*, or *Syria*,] and promulgated in China." The principal inscription is in Chinese characters; and consists of twenty eight columns, each containing sixty two words. It first states the fundamental principles of christianity; and then recounts the arrival of the missionaries in 636, their gracious reception by the king, their labors and success, and the principal events of the mission, for 144 years, or till AD. 780. There were two persecutions, in the years 699 and 713. Soon after the second persecution, some new missionaries arrived. Then follows the date and erection of the monument, in AD. 782. On the one side of this principal inscription, there is a column of Chinese characters; on the other side, and at the bottom, is a Syriac inscription, in the *Estrangelo* character, containing catalogues of priests, deacons, and others, with a bishop, arranged in seven different classes. *Tr.*]

(2) See *Renaudot*, loc. cit. p. 51, 68 &c. et passim. *Asseman*, loc. cit. cap. ix. pa. 522 &c. *Theoph. Sigefr. Bayer* tells us, (Praefat. ad Museum Sinicum, p. 84.) that he possesses some testimonies, which put the subject beyond controversy. [It is the constant tradition of the Syrian christians, that *St. Thomas* the apostle, made an excursion to China; and the christians of *Malabar* celebrate this event in their ordinary worship; and their primate styled himself metropolitan of Hindoo and *China*, when the Portuguese first knew them. See *Tho. Yeates*, Indian church Hist. p. 71—84. See also *M. de Guignes*, Diss. in the 30th vol. (p. 802 &c.) of the *Memoires de litterature, tirées des Registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*: which contains a defence of the genuineness of the Sigan monument, against the objections of *la Croze* and *Beausobre*. Likewise *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xix. p. 291—298. *Tr.*]

(3) [Yet *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus* states, (de Administrando Imperio, c. 31. in *Bandurius*' Imperium Orientale p. 97. ed. Paris,) that the *Chrobates*, (the *Croations*,) who then inhabited Dalmatia, from which they had expelled the *Avars*, by order of *Heraclius*, made application to that emperor for religious instructors; and that he procured priests for them from Rome, who baptized them, and one of whom became their archbishop. See *Semler's Selecta Cap. Hist. Eccles.* Tom. ii. p. 20. *Lucius de Regno Dalmatiae*, L. i. c. 11. *Muratori*, Historia Italiae; and *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, in Calendar. Eccles. universae, Tom. i. p. 499 &c. *Schl.*]

(4) *Beda*, Historia Eccles. gentis Anglor. Lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 91 &c. cap. xiv. p. 116. Lib. iii. cap. xxi. p. 162. ed. *Chiflet*. *Rapin de Thoyras*, Histoire d'Angleterre, Tom. i. p. 222 &c.

need not believe, that this change was wholly owing to the sermons and exhortations of these Roman monks and teachers; a great part of it is rather to be ascribed to the christian wives of the kings and chiefs, who employed various arts to convert their husbands; and likewise to the rigorous laws enacted against the worshippers of idols;(5) not to mention other causes.

(5) See *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Britanniae*, Tom. i. p. 61. [According to *Beda*, *de Thoyras*, and the other writers on English church History, the progress of christianity among the Anglo-Saxons, in this century, was as follows. In the year 601, pope *Gregory* confirmed *Augustine* the archbishop of Canterbury; and advised him to appoint twelve suffragans under himself, and to send a bishop to York, who should in time become archbishop, and have also twelve suffragans. Yet Canterbury, or rather (on the death of *Augustine*) London, was to hold the primacy of all England. This arrangement was prospective, for the conversion of but a small part of the Saxons was as yet achieved. In 604, *Augustine* appointed *Justus* first bishop of Rochester in Kent, and *Mellitus* first bishop of London among the East Saxons, and named *Laurentius* to succeed himself in the see of Canterbury. *Augustine* died the next year, having been in England but eight years, and having extended christianity little farther than over Kent, and part of the present counties of Essex and Middlesex. *Laurentius* succeeded him. On the death of *Ethelbert*, the first christian king of Kent, in 616, his son and successor, *Eadbald*, married his own mother-in-law, and renounced christianity. Most of his subjects followed him in his apostacy. *Sebert* also, the christian king of Essex, was succeeded by pagan sons; who expelled christianity from their dominions, and obliged *Mellitus* the bishop to take refuge in Kent. The three English prelates, in despair, now resolved to quit England; and two of them actually retired to the continent. *Laurentius*, while preparing to remove, pretended to receive, one night, a flagellation and a severe reprimand from *St. Peter*, for thus deserting the sheep of *Christ* and leaving them among wolves. The next morning he reported the matter to king *Eadbald*, and showed him his fresh wounds. The king was so moved, that, he annulled his incestuous marriage, returned to the christian faith, recalled the exiled bishops, and reestablished christianity in his dominions. Thus *Kent* became permanently christianized. The East Saxons were not so easily reclaimed; nor were they the next to embrace christianity.—In the year 625, *Edwin*, king of Northumberland, including all the north of England, married *Ethelburga*, sister of *Eadbald* king of Kent, and daughter of queen *Bertha*, engaging to tolerate her religion. She took with her *Paulinus*, who was ordained bishop for that purpose. The consequence was, that king *Edwin*, *Coify* his pagan high-priest, his nobles, and most of his subjects, embraced christianity; and *Paulinus* in the year 627, baptized 12,000 Northumbrians in one day, in the river Swale, near Richmond. *Paulinus* became archbishop of York, and propagated christianity, to some extent, in East Anglia, which included the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, and the isle of Ely. But in 633, king *Edwin* was slain in battle, and a great apostacy ensued. *Paulinus*, in despair, returned to Kent, and became bishop of Rochester. Soon after, *Oswald* mounted the throne of Northumberland, after a long exile among the monks of Scotland. He being a christian, labored to restore christianity. The Scottish monks sent him first *Corman*, and then the famous *Aidan*, bishop of Lindisfarne or Holy Island, to assist him. Thus christianity became permanently established in *Northumberland*.—The people of *East Anglia* also returned to the christian faith, about the year 636; their exile king, *Sigebert*, having brought with him from France *Felix*, a Burgundian priest, who became bishop of Dumnoe, now Dunwich. *Oswald* and *Sigebert* are said to have patronized learning, and set up schools throughout their dominions.—The kingdom of *Wessex*, including seven counties in the southwest of England, was converted about AD. 635, by *Berinus*, a missionary directly from Rome, who became bishop of Dorchester.—*Sigebert* II, king of the *East Saxons*, who occupied the counties of Essex, Middlesex, and part of Hertfordshire, was persuaded, by his friend *Osory* king of Northumberland, to embrace christianity; and he by the aid of *Chad* or *Cedda*, a Northumbrian prelate

§ 3. Many of the Britons, Scotch and Irish, in this century, eager to propagate the christian religion, visited the Batavian, Belgic, and German tribes, and there founded new churches. And this it was, that led the Germans afterwards to erect so many monasteries for Scotts and Irishmen; some of which are still in being.(6) *Columbanus*, with a few companions, had already, in the preceding century, happily extirpated in Gaul and the contiguous regions, the ancient idolatry, the roots of which had previously struck deep every where: and he persevered in these labors, till the year 615, in which his death is placed; and with the aid of his disciples, carried the name of the Savior to the Swabians, Bavarians, Franks, and other nations of Germany.(7) *St. Gall*, one of his companions, imparted a knowledge of christianity to the Helvetians and Swabians.(8) *St. Kilian*, a Scotchman,

who was translated to London, permanently restored christianity among the East Saxons, about the year 660.—*Mercia*, including about seventeen of the midland counties, gradually became christian, after the middle of the century. *Penda* the prince became a christian in the lifetime of his pagan father, king *Penda*, at the instigation of his wife *Alchflida*, daughter of *Oswi* the king of Northumberland; and he spread christianity in the provinces over which he ruled. When made king, he soon brought the whole territory to embrace christianity.—The last Saxon kingdom, *Sussex*, including the counties of Surry and Sussex, was converted, about the year 686, by *Wilfrid*, an exiled bishop of Northumberland.—A great dispute arising about the *tonsure* of priests, (whether only a considerable spot, or the whole head, except a circular margin, should be shaved,) and about the time of *Easter*, those north of the Thames following the Irish or Gallic ritual, and those south of it, the Roman; a conference was held on these subjects, at Whitby, in the year 664. Here, *Oswy*, king of Northumberland, learning from the Romish party, that *St. Peter* had the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and that the other party could not deny that fact; declared he would not offend *St. Peter*; lest when he should arrive at the gates of heaven, he should find the door-keeper would not open to him. This wise thought, decided the question with the majority. Still, however, the controversy continued; and several bishops retired in disgust, or were removed from their sees. Soon after, a bishop elect, being sent to Rome for ordination as primate of England, died by the way; and the pope ordained and sent *Theodorus*, a native of Tarsus, and a man of talents. *Theodorus* arrived at Canterbury in 669, and for twenty one years was indefatigable in his efforts to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of England. For furtherance of his designs, he held a council or synod at *Hertford*, in 673, when annual synods were agreed upon, and other ecclesiastical regulations adopted. Another synod at Hatfield, in 680, established the faith of the English churches, on the basis of the five first general councils.—Hitherto, there had been but one bishop in each kingdom of the Heptarchy, except Kent, which had two bishops; but now, the ambition to rule, induced the primate, and some kings, to divide bishopricks, in order to diminish the power of the lordly prelates. Hence, about the end of the century, the Heptarchy contained sixteen bishoprics: viz. Canterbury and Rochester, in Kent; London, in Essex; Dunwich and Elmham, in East Anglia; Winchester and Sherburn, in Wessex; Litchfield, Leicester, Hertford, Worcester, and Synacester, in Mercia; and York, Lindisfarne, Hexam, and Withern, in Northumberland.—The Irish and Scotch churches were in a very prosperous state, during this century. *Tr.*]

(6) See *Acta Sanctor.* Tom. ii. Februar. p. 362.

(7) *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedicti*, Tom. ii. p. 560 &c. Tom. iii. p. 72, 339, 500, and elsewhere. *Adamanni*, Lib. iii. de *S. Columbano*; in *Hen. Canisii* *Lectiones Antiquae*, Tom. i. p. 674.—[See a brief account of *St. Columbanus*, above, p. 465, Note (14). *Tr.*]

(8) *Walafrid Strabo*, *Vita Sti. Galli*; in *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Ben-*

converted a great many to *Christ*, among the [*Franconians* or] eastern Franks.(9) Near the close of the century, in the year 690, *Willebrord*, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied with eleven of his countrymen, viz. *Suidbert*, *Wigbert*, *Acca*, *Wilibald*, *Unibald*, *Lebwin*, the two *Ewalds*, *Werenfrid*, *Marcellin*, and *Adalbert*, crossed over to *Batavia*, lying opposite to Britain, with a view to convert the Frieslanders to christianity. From thence they went, in the year 692, to *Fostelandia*, which most writers suppose to be the island of *Heligoland*: being driven from there

edicti, Tom. ii. p. 228. [ed. Venico, p. 215 &c.] *Hen. Canisii* Lectiones Antiquae, Tom. i. p. 783. [*St. Gall*, or *St. Gallus*, was born in Ireland, of religious parents, who early committed him to *Columbanus* for education. He became a monk of Bangor, under *Columbanus*, and was one of the 12 Irish monks, who left Ireland with *Columbanus*, about the year 589, traveled through England to the continent, and erected the monastery of *Luxeul* in Burgundy. When *Columbanus* was driven from this monastery, 20 years after, *St. Gall* accompanied him in exile. Ascending the Rhine, they penetrated the heart of Switzerland, about the year 610, and took residence among pagans, at *Tuggen*, at the head of the lake of *Zurich*. Attacking idolatry, *St. Gall* here burned the pagan temple, and cast their offerings into the lake. This enraged the people, and the monks had to flee. Travelling through the Canton of *St. Gall*, they came to *Arbon*, on the shores of the lake of *Constance*. Here *Willimar*, the presbyter of the place, treated them kindly, and aided them to form a settlement at *Bregents*, at the eastern extremity of the lake. Here the monks attempted to convert the surrounding pagans, and were not without some success. But at the end of two years, the unconverted procured an order from the duke, for the monks to quit the country. *Columbanus* and the rest now retired to *Bobbio*, in Italy; but *St. Gall* was left behind, sick. When recovered, he retired into the wilderness, with a few adherents, and erected the monastery of *St. Gall*, in the province of the same name. Here he spent the remainder of his days, in great reputation and honor. He refused the bishoprick of *Constance*, which he conferred on his pupil *John*. His monastery flourished much, and spread light over the surrounding country. *St. Gall* died at *Arbon*, but was interred in his monastery, at the age of 95, according to *Mabillon*. His sermon at the ordination of *John* at *Constance*, and some epistles, are published by *Canisius* loc. cit. His life by *Walifrid Strabo*, from which this notice is extracted, though full of legendary tales, is written in a far better style than the ordinary monkish biographies.—It appears, according to *Strabo*, that Switzerland was almost wholly pagan, when first visited by *Columbanus*, in 610; but that christianity had then made considerable progress in Germany, from the lake of *Constance* all along the right bank of the Rhine. *Tr.*]

(9) *Vita S. Kiliani*, in *Henr. Canisii* Lectiones Antiquae, Tom. iii. p. 171 &c. *J. Pet. de Ludewig*, *Scriptores rerum Würtzburgens.* p. 966. [See also the Life of *St. Kilian*, in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedict.* Tom. ii. p. 951—953. ed. Venice, 1733. According to the authorities, *St. Kilian*, *Chilian*, *Cylian*, *Cilian*, or *Kyllena*, was an Irishman, of honorable birth, and good education. In early life he had a great thirst for knowledge; and being very pious, and possessing a perfect knowledge of missionary enterprises, he planned one of his own. Taking with him *Coloman*, *Gallon* and *Arneval*, presbyters, *Donatus* a deacon, and 7 others, he penetrated into Franconia, which was wholly pagan, and took residence at *Herbipolis* or *Würtzburg*. Finding their prospects good, *Kilian*, *Coloman*, and *Totnan*, went to Italy, to obtain the papal sanction to their enterprise; which having readily obtained from *Canon*, (who was pope 11 months, ending Sept. 686,) they returned to *Würtzburg*, converted and baptized *Gosbert*, the duke, and a large number of his subjects. But afterwards, persuading the duke that it was unlawful for him to have his brother's wife, *Geilan*, she seized an occasional absence of her husband, and murdered all the missionaries. This cruel act is placed in the year 696. But the massacre did not prevent the progress of christianity; for the duchess became deranged, the assassins repented; and *St. Kilian* became the tutelar saint of *Würtzburg*. *Tr.*]

by *Radbod*, king of the Frieslanders, who put *Wigbert*, one of the company, to death, they wandered over *Cimbria* and the adjacent parts of *Denmark*. Returning to *Friesland*, in the year 693, they attacked the superstition of the country with better success. *Willebrord* was now created by the Roman pontiff, archbishop of *Wildeburg*, [since called *Utrecht*,] and died at an advanced age, among the Batavians: while his associates spread a knowledge of christianity among the Westphalians, and the neighboring nations.(10)

§ 4. Of these and other expeditions, undertaken for the extension of christianity, an impartial man who adheres to truth, will not pass an indiscriminate judgment. That some of these preachers were men of honest simplicity, and piety, no one can doubt. But most of them show manifest proofs of various sinful passions, of arrogance, avarice, and cruelty; and having received authority from the Roman pontiff to exercise their sacred functions among the barbarians, they did not so much collect holy congregations of devout christians, as procure for themselves a people, among whom they might act the part of sovereigns and lords. I cannot therefore strongly censure those, who suspect that some of these monks, being desirous of ruling, concealed for a time their vicious propensities under the veil of religion, and imposed upon themselves various hardships, that they might acquire the rank and honors of bishops and archbishops.

(10) *Alcuin*, Vita Willebrordi, in *Jo. Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened. Tom. iii. p. 604 &c. [559 &c. ed. Venice]. *Jo. Mölleri* Cimbria Litterata, Tom. ii. p. 980 &c. [*Beda*, Histor. Eccles. L. v. c. 11, 12. This famous missionary was born in Northumberland, about AD. 659, of pious parents. Educated in the monastery of *Ripon* (Hripensis), in Northumberland, at the age of 20, he went to Ireland, where he studied 12 years. At the age of 33, he commenced his mission, and sailed up the Rhine to Utrecht, in the dominions of *Radbod*, the pagan king of the Friesians. Soon after, he went to France, and by advice of king *Pipin*, visited Italy, and obtained the sanction of pope *Sergius* to his enterprise. Returning to Utrecht, he in vain attempted the conversion of *Radbod* and his subjects. Therefore proceeding northward, he landed at an island, called *Fosite-land*, which was on the confines of Denmark and Friesland, and so sacred that its fruits, its animals, and even its waters were holy, and whoever profaned them was to be punished with death. *Willibrod* and his company wholly disregarded the sacredness of the place, violated the laws, were arraigned before *Radbod*, who cast lots on their destiny, by which one was doomed to death, and the others dismissed. They now penetrated into Denmark. On their return to the confines of France, *Pipin*, who in 693 had vanquished *Radbod*, sent *Willibrod* again to Italy, to be consecrated archbishop of Utrecht. Pope *Sergius* now gave him the name of *Clemens*. Returning clothed with dignity, his friend *Pipin* aided him in his work; and for about 50 years, from his leaving England, he labored, and with much success, as the apostle of the Frieslanders. He died about the year 740, at the advanced age of 81. Thus far, *Alcuin's* narrative goes. Of his followers, it is said, that the two *Ewalds*, (the one called the *white*, and the other the *black Ewald*,) were put to death by a Saxon king, and their bodies cast into the Rhine; that *Suidbert* preached to the Bructeri near Cologne, and at last at *Kaiserswerth*, on the Rhine, where he died AD. 713; that *Willibald* became bishop of *Eichstadt* in Bavaria; and *Marcellinus*, bishop of the country along the Issel. Tr.]

§ 5. Of the Jews, very few, if any, voluntarily embraced christianity. But the christians compelled many of them, in different places, by means of penalties, to make an outward profession of belief in *Christ*. The emperor *Heraclius*, being incensed against them, as is reported, by the influence of christian doctors, made havoc of the miserable nation ; and ordered vast numbers of them to be dragged reluctantly to baptism.(11) The kings of Spain and Gaul, had no hesitation to do the same, notwithstanding the Roman pontiffs were opposed to it.(12) Such evils resulted from ignorance of the true principles of christianity, and the barbarism of the age.

(11) *Eutychius*, *Annales Ecclesiae Alexandr.* Tom. ii. p. 212 &c.

(12) [See some authorities on this subject, quoted by *Baronius*, *Annales Eccles.* ad ann. 614. sub fin. Tom. viii. p. 239 &c. Tr.]

CHAPTER II.

ADVERSITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Persecutions of the christians.—§ 2. Muhammed.—§ 3. Judgment concerning him —§ 4. Causes of the rapid progress of his religion.—§ 5. Disposition of the Muhammedans towards the christians.—§ 6. Sects among them.

§ 1. The christians suffered less in this, than in the preceding centuries. By the Persian kings, they were at times persecuted; but the rage against them soon subsided. In England, some of the petty kings oppressed the new converts to christianity: but soon after, these kings themselves became professed christians. In the East, especially in Syria and Palestine, the Jews sometimes rose upon the christians, with great violence;(1) yet so unsuccessfully, as to suffer severely for their temerity. Those living among the christians, who secretly consulted about restoring the pagan religions, were too weak, to venture on any positive measures.

§ 2. But a new and most powerful adversary of christianity, started up in *Arabia*, AD. 612, in the reign of *Heraclius*. *Muhammed* was, indeed, an illiterate man;(2) but still an Arab nobleman, naturally eloquent, and possessing great acuteness of mind.(3) He proclaimed that he was sent of God, to overthrow all polytheism; and also to purge and reform, first, the religions of the Arabs, and next, those of the Jews and the christians:

(1) *Eutychius*, Annales, Tom. ii. p. 236 &c. *Jo. Hen. Hottinger*, Historia Orientalis, Lib. i. c. iii. p. 129 &c.

(2) *Muhammed* himself professed to be destitute of science and learning, and even to be unable to read and write: and his followers have deduced from this his ignorance, an argument for the divinity of the religion which he taught. But it is hardly credible, that he was so rude and ignorant a man. And there are some among his adherents, who question the reality of the fact. See *Jo. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, Tom. iv. p. 33, 34. Indeed, when I consider that *Muhammed*, for a long time, pursued a gainful commerce, in Arabia and the adjacent countries; I think, he must have been able to read, and write, and cast accounts; for merchants cannot dispense with this degree of knowledge.

(3) The writers on his life and religion, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Delectus et Syllabus Argumentor. pro veritate religionis Christianae, cap. l. p. 733 &c. To which may be added count *Boulanvilliers*, Vie de Mahomet, Lond. 1730. 8vo. which however, is rather a romance, than a history. *Jo. Gagnier*, Vie de Mahomet, 2 vol. 12mo. Amsterd. 1732; is commendable for the ingenuousness of the author; yet the style is dry. *George Sale*, a distinguished and very judicious author, in his Preliminary discourse, prefixed to his version of the Koran, sec. ii. [p. 45 &c. ed. Lond. 1825. *H. Prideaux*, Life of Mahomet, 1697, 8vo. *Abulfeda*, Annales Muslem. Ar. and Lat. 2 vol. 4to. Hafniae 1790. *Abulfeda*, de Vita et Rebus Gestis Mohammedis, Arab. and Lat. Oxon. 1723. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xix. p. 327—405. Tr.]

and having framed a law, which is called the *Koran*,⁽⁴⁾ after gaining some victories over his enemies, he compelled an immense multitude of persons, first in Arabia, and then in the neighboring countries, to assent to his doctrines. Elated with this unexpected success, he now began to think of founding an empire; and he effected his object, with as much success, as boldness; so that, at his death, he saw himself the sovereign of all Arabia, and of several of the neighboring countries.

§ 3. No one can, at this day, form a perfect judgment of the entire character, views, and designs of *Muhammed*. For we cannot safely rely on the Greek writers, who made no hesitation to load their enemy with slanders and falsehoods; nor can we trust to the Arabians, who are the very worst historians, who conceal all his vices and crimes, and depict him as altogether a divine person. Besides, a very considerable part of his life, and that too, from which the motives and secret springs of his con-

(4) For an account of the *Koran*, see, in preference to all others, *Geo. Sale*, Preliminary Discourse, prefixed to his English version of that book. Add *Ver-tot*, Discours sur l' Alcoran; annexed to the third volume of his History of the Knights of Malta, in French: *Jo. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, Tom. ii. p. 281, new ed. The book which the Muhammedans call the *Koran*, is a collection of papers and discourses discovered and published, after the death of Muhammed; and is not that *Law*, which he so highly extolled. Perhaps some parts of the true *Koran*, are still found in the modern *Koran*: but that the *Koran* or *Law*, which Muhammed prescribed to the Arabians, differed from the present *Koran*, is manifest from the fact, that Muhammed in our *Koran* appeals to and extols that other the true *Koran*. A book which is commended and extolled in any writing, must certainly be different from that in which it is commended. May we not conjecture, that the true *Koran* was an *Arabic poem*, which Muhammed recited to his adherents, and wished them to commit to memory, but which he did not write out? Such, it is well known, were the laws of the Gallic *Druids*; and such is said to be that Indian law, which the *Brahmins* learn and preserve in their memories. [These conjectures of *Dr. Mosheim*, appear wholly without foundation. There is no reason to believe, there ever was a *Koran* essentially different from that we now have; or that Muhammed declined committing his pretended revelations to writing. The only argument adduced by *Dr. Mosheim*, is of no force at all, considering the manner in which the *Koran* came into existence. The book itself professes to have been composed by God, in the highest heavens; and thence sent down to the lower heavens, by the angel *Gabriel*; who communicated it, by parcels, to *Muhammed*, during the twenty three years that he claimed to be a prophet. Moreover, the parcels revealed last, often revoked or modified what had been revealed before; and likewise replied to the objections of infidels against the book. See *Sale's Koran*, vol. i. ed. Lond. 1825. ch. vi. p. 159. and vol. ii. ch. x. p. 31. ch. xvi. p. 107. ch. xxv. p. 213. ch. xcvi. p. 497. The Muhammedan doctors say, the *Koran* existed, together with the decrees of God, from all eternity, engraven on a table of stone, hard by the throne of God, and called the *Preserved table*; that God sent the angel *Gabriel*, with a transcript of the entire *Koran*, down to the lowest heavens, where, during 23 years, he revealed it by parcels to *Muhammed*; that Muhammed caused these parcels to be written down by his scribe, as they were received, and published them at once to his followers, some of whom took copies, while the greater part got them by heart; that the original MSS. of the scribe, when returned, were thrown promiscuously into a chest, whence they were taken, after the prophet's death, and published collectively, in their present form and order, which is wholly without regard to dates, or a classification of subjects. See *Sale's Prelim. Discourse*, sec. iii. p. 77—95. Tr.]

duct would best appear, lies concealed from us. It is very probable, however, that abhorrence of the superstition, in which he saw his countrymen involved, so wrought upon him as to throw him into a disordered state of mind ; and that he really believed, he was divinely commissioned to reform the religion of the Arabs, and reinstate among them the worship of the one true God. But it is also certain, that afterwards, when he saw his attempts going into successful operation, he deluded the fickle, credulous multitude, with impious tricks and impositions, in order to strengthen his cause ; and even feigned divine revelations, whenever occasion seemed to require it, or any great difficulty occurred. Nor was this fraud inconsistent with his being a fanatic ; for most fanatics think deception, so far as seems necessary to their designs, to be holy and approved of God ; and they of course resort to deception, when they can do it safely.(5) The religion which he inculcated, is not what it would have been, if his designs had not been opposed. The pertinacity with which the Arabians adhered to the opinions and customs of their ancestors, and the hope of gaining over the Jews and the christians to his cause, undoubtedly led him to approve and to tolerate many things, which he would have rejected and abrogated, if he had been at liberty to pursue his own choice.

§ 4. The causes of the rapid propagation of this new religion among so many nations, are not difficult to be discovered. In the first place, the terror of arms, which *Muhammed* and his successors carried with great success into different countries, compelled vast multitudes to receive his law. In the next place, his law itself was admirably adapted to the natural dispositions of men, and especially to the manners, the opinions, and the vices prevalent among the people of the East : for it was extremely simple, proposing very few things to be believed ; nor did it enjoin many and difficult duties to be performed, or such as laid severe restraints on the propensities of men.(6) Moreover, the consummate ignorance, which characterized, for the most part, the Arabians, the Syrians, the Persians, and other nations of the East, gave a bold and eloquent man ready access to the minds of immense numbers. We may add, that the virulent contests among the christians, Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monophysites,

(5) This, in my judgment, is the best way of deciding the controversy, which has been agitated by learned men of our age ; whether *Muhammed* was a fanatic, or an impostor ? See *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire historique, Tome iii. Artic. *Mahomet*, Note K. *Sim. Ockley*, Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens, Tom. i. p. 68. Lond. 1708. 8vo *George Sale*, Preliminary Discourse, to his translation of the Koran, sec. ii. [p. 53 &c. ed. Lond. 1825. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xix, p. 380 &c. Tr.]

(6) See *Hadr. Reland*, de religione Mahumetica, Libri ii. Utrecht 1717. 12mo. *Geo. Sale*, Prelim. Dissert. to the Koran, Sec. iv, v, vi. [*Han. Moore*, Dictionary of all Religions, Art. *Mahometans*, ed. 1817. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xix. p. 356 &c. Tr.]

which filled a large part of the East with carnage and horrible crimes, rendered their religion odious in the eyes of many. And the Monophysites and Nestorians, whom the Greeks oppressed most grievously, rendered assistance to the Arabians, and thus facilitated their conquest of some provinces.(7) Other causes will suggest themselves, to those who consider attentively the state of the world, and the character of the Muhammedan religion.

§ 5. After the death of *Muhammed*, in the year 632, his followers issuing forth from Arabia, with their native fortitude stimulated by a furious fanaticism, and aided, as has been already observed, by those christians who were persecuted by the Greeks, extended their conquests over Syria, Persia, Egypt and some other countries.(8) Nor could the Greeks, harrassed with intestine commotions and various wars, put forth *sufficient* energy to check their rapid career. The victors, at first, used their prosperity with moderation; and were very indulgent towards the christians, especially to those who opposed the decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon. But, as is common with those enjoying uninterrupted success, they insensibly swerved from this moderation into severity, and so loaded the christians with taxes and other burdens and injuries, that their condition more resembled that of slaves, than that of citizens.

§ 6. The civil dissensions among the Muhammedans, which arose soon after the death of their prophet, were not a little injurious to the success of their enterprises. *Abubeker*, the father-in-law, and *Ali*, the son-in-law, of *Muhammed*, had hard contention about the right to the throne, which each claimed to himself; and this controversy being handed down to posterity, divided the whole race into two great parties, separated not only by a difference in opinions and practices, but also by deadly hatred. The two sects are called, the one *Sonnites*, and the other *Shiites*.(9) The former contend, that *Abubeker* was the true *Kalif*; the latter, that *Ali* was the legitimate successor of *Muhammed*. Both regard the *Koran* as of divine origin, and the authoritative rule in religion; but the *Sonnites* unite with it the *Sonna*, a sort of oral law, derived from *Muhammed*, and serving to explain the *Koran*; which the *Shiites* wholly discard. The Turks, Tartars, Africans, and most of the Indians, are *Sonnites*; the Persians and Mogores are *Shiites*; yet the Mogores seem to be-

(7) See *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 163, 169. [and *Gibbon*, Decline and Fall &c. ch. li. where this is shewn by the conduct of the *Copts*, or *Jacobites* in Egypt. Tr.]

(8) See *Simon Ockley*, Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens, vol. i. Lond. 1708, and vol. ii. Lond. 1817. 8vo. [also *Gibbon*, Decline and Fall &c. ch. l, li. Tr.]

(9) See *Adr. Reland*, de Religione Turcica, Lib. i. p. 36, 70, 74, 85 *Joh. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, Tom. ii. p. 236 &c.

long to neither sect.(10) Besides these two grand divisions, there are among the Muhammedans, four principal sects, and a great many subordinate ones; which contend sharply respecting various subjects in religion, yet practice mutual toleration.(11)

(10) The principles of the *Sonnites* may be learned from the tract published by *Adr. Reland*, de Relig. Turcica, Lib. i. The religion and opinions of the *Shiites* are clearly stated by *Joh. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, Tome iv, the whole.

(11) On the Muhammedan sects, see *Jo. Henr. Hottinger*, Historia Orientalis, Lib. ii, cap. vi. p. 340. *Ricaut*, Etat de l'Empire Ottoman, Lib. ii. p. 242. *Jo. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, Tom. ii. p. 236. *Geo. Sale*, Preliminary Discourse to the Koran, sec. viii. p. 207 &c.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. State of learning. The monks its patrons. § 2. Ignorance of the bishops.—
§ 3. History and other sciences, corrupted.—§ 4. State of philosophy.

§ 1. The profound ignorance and barbarism of this century, will hardly appear credible, to those who have not themselves inspected the productions it has transmitted to us. What little of learning and knowledge still remained, with a few exceptions, was confined to the cloisters of the monks, especially in the western or Latin church. The laws forbid any one to be made an *abbot*, unless he had some learning. The monks were required to devote certain hours to reading; and that they might derive greater profit from this exercise, they were required, in most monasteries, to converse together, at stated times, on what they had read.(1) It was their business also to educate young men destined for the sacred office. But all the institutions of this sort, were of little service to the cause of learning and to the church; because very few had any just conception of the nature and utility of the liberal arts and sciences; and most of them were more intent on the perusal of worthless writers, and the lives of saints, than on the study of valuable authors. Those who did best, were assiduous in perusing the works of *Augustine* and *Gregory* the Great; and scraps gathered from these fathers, constitute the best productions of the Latin church in this century.

§ 2. Kings and noblemen were attentive to every thing, rather than to the cause of learning. The rude and unlearned bishops suffered the schools, which had been committed to their care, to languish and become extinct.(2) It was very rare to find among them, such as could compose their own public discourses. Those who possessed some genius among them, garbled from *Augustine* and *Gregory* a parcel of jejune addresses; a part of which they kept for their own use, and the rest they imparted to their more

(1) *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* Tom. ii. p. 479, 513, et passim.

(2) *Histoire littéraire de la France*, par les Moines Benedict. Sept. Siècle, Tome iii. p. 428 &c.

dull and stupid colleagues, that *they* might have something they could pronounce. This is manifest from the examples of *Caesarius* of Arles, and of *Eligius* of Noyon. There is extant also a Summary of Theology, which was unskillfully compiled by *Tajo*, bishop of Saragossa, from the writings of *Augustine* and *Gregory* : and this insipid performance was so highly esteemed, that the other bishops did not hesitate to pronounce the author of it *the true salt of the earth*, and a *divine luminary* in the church.(3) Many such proofs of the ignorance of the times, may be easily collected, by one acquainted with the writers of this century. England, however, was in a happier state, in this respect, than the other countries of Europe : for *Theodorus*, a Cilician, and bishop of Canterbury, of whom more will be said hereafter, introduced into that country some attachment to letters and learning.(4)

§ 3. The Greeks who attempted to write, either in poetry or in prose, obscured very plain and simple subjects by their tumid and fustian style. The style of the Latins, with a few exceptions, was so base and corrupt, that it was not even capable of the same fault. History was wretchedly degraded and perverted, both by the Greeks and the Latins. Among the former, *Moschus*, *Sophronius*, and others, and among the latter, *Braulio*, *Jonas* an Hibernian, *Audoenus*, *Dado*, and *Adamannus*, have transmitted to us biographies of several saints, which are insipid and ridiculous, and destitute alike of an air of probability and of elegance of composition. The Greeks led the way in committing to writing whatever reports were in circulation among the vulgar, in regard to more ancient times, without discrimination : and hence originated those medleys of fables, which the Latins afterwards so greedily caught up and retained.

§ 4. Philosophy, among the Latins, was at an end. Those who were unwilling to neglect it altogether, were satisfied with committing to memory a few words and sentences, taken from *Boethius* and *Cassiodorus*. For they were not disposed to reason on the subject ; and they were unable to consult the Greeks, from ignorance of their language. The Greeks, abandoning *Plato* to certain of the monks, betook themselves to *Aristotle* ; whose precepts were nearly indispensable, in the theological contests of the age, with the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Monothelites : for all these resorted to the Stagirite for aid, whenever they were called to the combat. Hence *James* of Edessa, a Monophysite of this century, translated Aristotle's *Dialectics* into Syriac.(5)

(3) *Jo. Mabillon*, *Analecta veteris aevi*, Tom. ii. p. 77.

(4) *Dar. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Britanniae*, Tom. i. p. 42. *Herm. Conringius*, *Antiquitates Academicae*, p. 277.

(5) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* Tom. i. p. 498.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Disputes about preeminence, between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.—§ 2. The former opposed by many.—§ 3. Vices of the clergy.—§ 4. state of the monks.—§ 5. Greek writers.—§ 6. Latin writers.

§ 1. The contest for preeminence between the Roman and Constantinopolitan prelates, had gained such a height in this century, that we may clearly discern the commencement of that unhappy schism, which afterwards separated the Latins from the Greeks. It is commonly asserted, by men of the greatest learning, and best acquainted with ancient history, that the Roman pontiff, *Boniface III*, prevailed on that abominable tyrant, *Phocas*, who, after murdering the emperor *Mauritius*, mounted the imperial throne, to divest the bishop of Constantinople of the title of *oecumenical bishop*, and to confer it on the Roman pontiff. But this is stated, solely on the authority of *Baronius*; (1) for no ancient writer has given such testimony. Yet *Phocas* did something analogous to this; if we may believe *Anastasius*, and *Paul Diaconus*. (2) For whereas the Bishops of Constantinople had maintained, that their church was not only fully equal to that of Rome, but had precedence of all other churches, *Phocas* forbid this, and determined that the priority of rank and dignity should be given to the church of Rome.

§ 2. The Roman pontiffs used indeed every means, to maintain and to enlarge the power and dignity which they had obtained: yet the history of this period affords many proofs, not only that emperors and kings, but that nations also, resisted those attempts. Many indications of the existence of the regal power, in religious

(1) [*Baronius*, *Annales*, ad ann. 606, No. 2. *Schl.*]

(2) *Anastasius*, de *Vitis Pontificum*, (*Bonifacius III*). *Paulus Diaconus*, de *Rebus gestis Longobardor.* Lib. iv. cap. 37. in *Muratorii*, *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* Tom. i. P. i. p. 465. [*Anastasius* says, that "whereas the church of Constantinople had claimed to be the first of all the churches, *Boniface* obtained from the emperor *Phocas*, that the Romish church, the apostolic seat of the blessed apostle *Peter*, (*caput esset omnium ecclesiarum*) should be the head of all the churches." *Paul Diaconus* says: "This emperor, *Phocas*, at the request of pope *Boniface*, decreed that the see of the Roman and apostolic church should be the first, (*primam esse*,) whereas the Constantinopolitan had before assumed to be the first of all."—By being the first and the head, both the bishops of Constantinople, and the usurper *Phocas*, seem to have understood merely *priority of rank*; and not that *supreme authority*, and *dominion*, which the Roman pontiffs afterwards claimed. It was intended as a *compliment*; but it was construed into a *grant of unlimited power*. See *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, (*Boniface III.*) vol. ii. p. 545 &c. ed. Lond. 1750. *Tr.*]

matters, and even over the pope himself, may be collected from the Byzantine history, and from the *Formulas* of *Marculfus*. The Roman writers tell us, that *Constantine Pogonatus* formally relinquished the right of confirming the election of a Roman pontiff: and they cite *Anastasius* as a witness; who states, that *Pogonatus* ordered, that a Roman pontiff elect, should be ordained forthwith and without delay.(3) But this testimony does not reach the point to be proved. It appears however, to have been the fact, that this emperor, in the time of the pontiff *Agatho*, remitted the customary payment to the court, of a sum of money for the confirmation of a pontifical election.(4) The ancient Brittons and Scotts could not be moved, for a long time, either by the threats or the promises of the papal legates, to subject themselves to the Roman decrees and laws; as is abundantly testified by *Beda*.(5) The Gauls and the Spaniards, as no one can deny, attributed just so much authority to the pontiff, as they supposed would be for their own advantage.(6) Nor in Italy itself, could he make the bishop of Ravenna, and others, bow obsequiously to his will.(7) And of private individuals, there were many who

(3) *Anastasius*, de Vitis Pontif. (Benedict.) in *Muratori*, Scriptor. rerum Italic. Tom. iii. p. 146. [The words of *Anastasius* are: concessit, ut persona, quae electa fuerit in sedem Apostolicam, e vestigio absque tarditate Pontifex ordinaretur. That is, it should not be necessary to write to Constantinople, but merely to obtain liberty from the emperor's vicerent, the exarch of Ravenna, previously to the ordination. Moreover history shows, that succeeding emperors did not respect this privilege. *Schl.*]

(4) *Anastasius*, de Vitis Pontiff. (Agatho.) p. 144. Compare *Jo. Ja. Mascov*, Historia Germanor. Tom. ii. Note, p. 121 &c. [According to *Anastasius*, the emperor did not wholly remit, but only diminish the amount of the payment; relevata est quantitas, quae solita est dari; and this too, with the express injunction, that the ancient rule should be observed, and no ordination take place, till the consent of the emperor should be obtained from court. See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, (Agatho,) vol. iii. p. 131 &c. ed. Lond. 1754. *Tr.*]

(5) [*Beda*, Hist. Eccles. L. ii. c. 2. L. iii. c. 25. *Schl.* The case of *Wilfrid* bishop of York, who being deposed and banished by the Saxon king, in 678, appealed to Rome, and returned acquitted; but was imprisoned 9 months, and then banished the kingdom; is a strong case in point. See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, (Agatho) vol. iii. p. 98—105. *Tr.*]

(6) [It is well known, that the French kings often deposed bishops; whom the popes, by all their efforts, were not able to restore; and that in Spain, *Julianus* the bishop of Toledo, freely censured pope *Benedict II*, for sending into Spain his disapprobation of a synodic letter; and accused his holiness of ignorance, negligence, and jealousy. Yet this *Julianus* is a canonized saint. See the 15th council of Toledo, in *Harduin*, Concil. Tom. iii. p. 1761 &c. *Schl.*]

(7) *Mich. Geddes*, Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii. p. 6 &c. [and *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, vol. iv. p. 157; where is a diploma of the emperor *Constantine IV*. in which he releases *Maurus*, archbishop of Ravenna, from obedience to the pope. At his death, this archbishop warned his clergy not to subject themselves to the Roman pontiff, but to apply to the emperor for a pall for the new archbishop. And to the present time, the archbishops claim a kind of independence of the Romish see. Even the abbot, *St. Columbanus*, defends the ancient Irish manner of keeping Easter, against the popes, with great intrepidity; and likewise the subject of the three Chapters; and this, at the instigation of king *Agilulph*. He maintains, that *Vigilius* was not watchful enough, and that the pope ought to purge the seat of St. Peter from all errors, from which it was not now free. See his five Epistles, in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Lugd. Tom. xii. p. 1 &c. *Schl.*]

expressed openly their detestation of his vices and his greediness of power. Nor are those destitute of arguments, who assert that the Waldenses, even in this age, had fixed their residence in the vallies of Piedmont, and inveighed freely against Roman domination.(8)

§ 3. That the bishops of inferior rank, and all who were intrusted with sacred offices, as well those in the monasteries, as those without, lived in the practice of many enormities, is expressly admitted by every writer of any note in this century. Every where, simony, avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, insolence to the people at large, and even vices worse than these, might be seen reigning in the places consecrated to holiness and virtue.(9) Between the monks and the bishops, many pertinacious quarrels existed in different places. For the latter laid their greedy hands on the rich possessions of the monks, that they might support their own luxury. And the monks, feeling this very sensibly, first applied to the emperors and kings; but not finding *their* protection adequate, resorted to the Roman pontiff.(10) He therefore readily took them under his care, and gradually exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops. The monks, in return, defended the interest of the pontiff, as if it were their own; and they recommended him, as a sort of God, to the ignorant multitude, over whom their reputed sanctity gave them great influence. That these *exemptions* of the monks were the cause of many of their vices and disorders, is admitted by many of the best writers.(11)

§ 4. In the mean time the monks, from the favor of the pontiff, and their display of fictitious piety, were every where making surprising progress, especially among the Latins. Parents ea-

(8) *Anton. Leger*, Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises, Lib. i. p. 15 &c. [and *Spanheim*, Introduct. plen. Tom. ii. p. 598 &c. *Schl.*]

(9) [Thus we read, of *Desiderius* a nobleman, that he assumed the garb of a beggar, and conducted *Brunechild*, who was expelled the court of Theodebert, in safety to the court of Burgundy. At her solicitation, her faithful conductor was advanced to the bishopric of Auxerre; (*Daniel*, History of France, vol. i. p. 351. of the German translation;) a worthy candidate for the episcopal office! To the *simony* of the clergy, the national Synod of Toledo, AD. 653, Can. 3. bears testimony: to their *avarice*, the provincial synod of Merida in Spain, (*Harduin*, Tom. iii. p. 997.) to their *violence*, the council of Braga, AD. 675. where they were forbidden to inflict blows. In the same year, a council at Toledo commanded the clergy to read the bible, on pain of excommunication; (*Harduin*, Tom. iii. p. 1017.) and required every new bishop to make oath, that he had neither paid nor promised to pay money for his bishopric. Even the papal chair was not free from simony. To the *pious frauds* must be reckoned, the multitude of fables, which were emulously fabricated. Quite a collection of them, is exhibited by *Dr. Semler*, *Historiae Eccles. selecta Capita*, Tom. ii. p. 55 &c. 60 &c. *Schl.*]

(10) See *Jo. Launoy*, *Assertio inquisitionis in Chartam immunitatis S. Germani*; *Opp.* Tom. iii. Pt. i. p. 50 &c. *Baluze*, *Miscellan.* Tom. ii. p. 159, Tom. iv. p. 108. *Muratori*, *Antiquit. Italic.* Tom. ii. p. 944, 949 &c.

(11) See *Jo. Launoy*, *Examen privilegii S. Germani*; *Opp.* Tom. iii. Pt. i. p. 282. *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Britanniae*, Tom. i. p. 43, 44, 49. &c.

gerly consecrated their children to God, with good portions of their property made over to the monasteries; that is, they devoted them to what was esteemed the highest bliss on earth, a life of solitude.(12) Those who had spent their lives in guilty deeds, hoped to expiate their crimes, by conferring the greater part of their property on some company of monks. And immense numbers, impelled by superstition, robbed their heirs of their richest possessions, in order to render God propitious to them, through the prayers of monks. Rules for monastic life were drawn up by *Fructuosus*, *Isidorus*, *John Gerundinensis*, *Columbanus*, and others, among the Latins:(13) for, the *Rule* prescribed by St. *Benedict*, was not as yet become the universal and the only rule.

§ 5. Among the writers, few can be named, who were respectable for their genius or erudition. The best among the Greeks were the following. *Maximus*, a monk who contended very fiercely against the Monothelites, and wrote some explanatory works on the scriptures, was by no means destitute of native talent; but he was a man of a violent spirit, and in that respect, unhappy.(14) *Isichius*, bishop of Jerusalem, expounded some Books of scripture, and has left us a few *Homilies*, and other minor works.(15) *Dorotheus*, an abbot in Palestine, acquired

(12) *Gervais*, Histoire de l' Abbé Suger, Tome i. p. 9—16.

(13) *Lucas Holstenius*, Codex Regular. Tom. ii. p. 225 &c.

(14) [*Maximus* was born of noble parentage, at Constantinople, about AD. 580. The emperor *Heraclius* made him his secretary, and intended he should write the civil history of his times. But the emperor falling into the heresy of the Monothelites, which *Maximus* abhorred, either disagreement between them, or the propensity of *Maximus* to a monkish life, led him to retire from court, and take residence in a monastery at Chrysopolis near Constantinople. Here *Maximus* became the abbot. Before the year 640, the prevalence of Monothelitic principles, or the political disquietudes of the country, led him to travel. He went to Egypt, where he had warm disputes with the principal Monothelites. In the year 645 he went to Rome, and enjoyed the intimacy of pope *Martin I*. In 653, the emperor *Constans II*, who was a Monothelite, caused him to be arrested and brought to Constantinople, to be tried for seditious conduct. He was acquitted; but refusing to promise silence, in the controversy then raging with the Monothelites, he was banished to Thrace, and confined in different places, till the year 662, when he died in the castle of Schemra, on the confines of the Alans. His collected works, published Gr. and Lat. by *Fran. Combefis*, Paris 1675, 2 vol. Fol. consist of about 50 small works, answers to biblical questions, polemic and dogmatic tracts, moral and monastic pieces, and Letters. Besides these, he has left us Commentaries, on the Canticles, on *Dionysius Arcopagita*, and on some parts of *Gregory Nyssen*. He is an inelegant, obscure, metaphysical, and mystical writer, yet learned and zealous. Tr.]

(15) See *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiast. de M. du Pin, Tom. i. p. 261. [*Hesychius* or *Isychius*, first a presbyter, and then bishop of Jerusalem, flourished about AD. 601. A Commentary on *Leviticus* in vii. Books, is extant in a Latin translation; about which there has been much discussion, whether it was a production of this *Hesychius*, or of some other. See *Labbé*, Dis. Historica; in *Bellarmin*, de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. p. 227 &c. ed. Venice, 1727. The works of *Hesychius*, which are extant in Greek, are Arguments to the twelve Minor Prophets and *Isaiah*; two hundred Sentences on temperance and virtue; seven *Homilies*; a life of St. *Longinus*; an Introduction to the

fame by the *Ascetic Dissertations*, with which he would instruct monks how to live.(16) *Antiochus*, a superstitious monk of St. Sabas in Palestine, composed a *Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*, that is, Institutes of the christian Religion, a work of no great merit.(17) *Sophronius*, bishop of Jerusalem, acquired the veneration of after ages, by his conflicts with those reputed as heretics in his days, especially with the *Monothelites*.(18) He was evidently the cause of the whole Monothelite controversy. *Andreas* of Crete, has left us several *Homilies*, which are neither truly pious, nor eloquent; and which some therefore suspect, were falsely ascribed to him.(19) *Gregory Pisides*, a Constantinopolitan deacon, besides a *History of Heraclius and of the Avars*, composed a few poems and other short pieces.(20)

book of Psalms; and a Comment on Ps. 77—107, and 118. He also wrote an Eccles. History; and some other Commentaries, which are lost. See *Cave*, Hist. Lit. Tom. i. p. 571 &c. Tr.]

(16) [*Dorotheus*, probably lived about AD. 601. He wrote twenty four ethical and ascetic dissertations, (*διδασκαλίας seu Doctrinae, de vita recte et pie instituenda*), and several Epistles; which are extant, Gr. and Lat. in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuarium. Tom. i. Tr.]

(17) [*Antiochus* flourished AD. 614, and was alive in 629. His *Pandecte divinae Scripturae*, or Compendium of the christian religion and of the holy scriptures, comprized in 130 *Homilies*, is extant in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuarium, Tom. i. He also wrote *de vitiosis Cogitationibus liber*; and, *de Vita S. Euphrosyni*.

(18) See the *Acta Sanctor. Tom. ii. Martii, ad diem xi. p. 65.* [*Sophronius* was a native of Damascus, and for some time a sophist, or teacher of philosophy and eloquence. He afterwards became a monk in Palestine; and in this character he sat in the council of Alexandria, held by *Cyrus* the patriarch of that see, in the year 633, for the purpose of uniting the Monothelites and the catholics. Here *Sophronius* zealously opposed the 7th of the nine propositions which *Cyrus* wished to establish. From Alexandria, he went to Constantinople, to confer with *Sergius* the patriarch of that see, on the subject. Soon after, he was made patriarch of Jerusalem, and wrote his long Epistle or Confutation of the Monothelites, addressed to *Honorius* the Roman pontiff, and to the other patriarchs. But his country was now laid waste. The Saracens having conquered all the northern parts of Syria, laid siege to Jerusalem in 637. The city capitulated to the Kalif *Omar*, who entered Jerusalem, treated *Sophronius* with much respect, promised him and the christians safety and the free exercise of their religion; and having given orders for erecting the mosk of Omar on the site of the temple, retired to Arabia. *Sophronius* died a few months after, in the same year. His works are, the Epistle or Dissertation above mentioned; four *Homilies*; an account of the labors and travels of the apostle Paul; the Life of St. *Mary*, an Egyptian; and a tract on the Incarnation. The best account of him and his writings, is said to be that of *J. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 199 &c. See *Cave*, Hist. Lit. Tom. i. p. 519. Tr.]

(19) [*Andreas* was a native of Damascus, became a monk at Jerusalem, a deacon at Constantinople, and at last archbishop of Crete. His age is not certain; but he was contemporary with *Sophronius* of Jerusalem. AD. 635, and lived some years after. *Fr. Combefis* published, as his works, Paris 1644, in Fol. Gr. and Lat. seventeen *Homilies*; nine *Triodia*, Canons, or church Hymns; and several shorter Hymns, adapted to different festivals. He afterwards published three more *Homilies*, and some poems, in his Auctuar. Nov. Tom. i. and ii. A *Computus Paschalis*, ascribed to *Andreas*, was published, Gr. and Lat. by *Dionys. Petavius*, de Doctrina Tempor. Tom. iii. The genuineness of some of these pieces, is suspected. Tr.]

(20) [*Gregory*, or rather *George*, of Pisida, was first a deacon and chartophylax of the great church of Constantinople, and then archbishop of Nicomedia. He

Theodorus of Raithu is author of a book against those sects, which were considered as corrupting christianity, by their doctrines concerning the person of *Jésus Christ*.(21)

flourished about AD. 640 ; and has left us *Cosmopoiea*, an iambic poem, on the Hexaëmeron, now in 1880 lines ; and another poem, in 261 iambic lines, on the vanity of life ; both published by *Morel*, Paris 1585. 4to. Three other of his poems, (Eulogy of *Heraclius* ; on his Persian wars ; and the assault of the *Avars* on *Constantinople*,) were promised to the public, by *Claud. Maltret* ; but were not published. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xix. p. 106 &c. *Cave*, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 583. Tr.]

(21) [*Theodorus*, a presbyter in the *Laura Raithu*, in *Palestine*, flourished AD. 646. and wrote a short treatise on the incarnation of Christ, in opposition to the heresies of *Manes*, *Appolinaris*, *Theodorus Mopsuest.* *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, *Julian Halicar.* *Severus*, and others. It is extant Gr. and Lat. in *Fronto Ducaeus*, *Auctuarium*, Tom. i. and in Latin, in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* Tom. viii. Tr.]

[The following Greek writers of this century, are passed over by *Dr. Mosheim* : namely,

John Malala, a native of *Antioch*, who probably flourished about AD. 601. He wrote *Historia chronica*, from the creation, to the death of *Justinian I.* AD. 565, which was published Gr. and Lat. by *Humphr. Hody*, Oxon. 1691. 8vo. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litter.* i. p. 568 &c.

About the same time lived *Eusebius* bishop of *Thessalonica*, *Conon* an opposer of *John Philoponus*, and *Themistius* surnamed *Colonymus* ; all polemic writers on the side of the catholics. But only fragments of their essays and epistles have reached us, in *Photius* and the *Acts of Councils*.

Sergius, patriarch of *Constantinople*, AD. 608—639, a favorer of the *Monothelite* doctrine, and instigator of the famous *Ecthesis* of *Honorius*. He has left us three *Epistles*, extant in the *Concilia*, Tom. vi.

Cyrus, bishop of *Phasis* AD. 620, and patriarch of *Alexandria* AD. 630—640. He held a synod at *Alexandria* in 633, in which he proposed a *Libellus satisfactionis*, in nine chapters, designed to unite the *Theodosians* or *Severians* to the catholics. But his 7th chapter, or position, containing the doctrine of the *Monothelites*, was opposed, and led to fierce contests. He also wrote three *Epistles* to his friend *Sergius* of *Constantinople*. All these are extant in the *Concilia*, Tom. vi.

Theophylactus Simocatta, an Egyptian, a sophist, and a prefect, who flourished AD. 611—629. He wrote *Historiae rerum a Mauritio gestarum Libri viii.* from the year 582—to 602. edited Gr. and Lat. Ingolst. 1603. 4to. and Paris 1648. Fol. also 85 short *Epistles*, (inter *Epistolas Graecanicas* *Aurel. Allobrog.* 1606. Fol.) and *Problema physica*, Gr. and Lat. Antw. 1598. 8vo.

Georgius, an abbot in *Galatia*, AD. 614. wrote the life of his predecessor *Theodorus* ; in *Surius* and other collectors of pious lives.

George patriarch of *Alexandria* AD. 620—630. He wrote the life of *John Chrysostom*, which is published with *Chrysostom's* works.

About the year 630, that valuable, but anonymous work, called the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, *Fastus Siculi*, and *Chronicon Paschale*, was composed ; perhaps by *George Pisides*, or by *George Patr.* of *Alexandria*. It extends from the creation, to AD. 628. The best edition is that of *du Fresne*, Paris 1689. Fol.

John, Moschus, *Eviratus*, or *Eueratus*, a monk of *Palestine*, who flourished AD. 630, after traveling extensively, wrote his monkish history, entitled *Pratum spirituale*, *Hortulus novus*, *Limonarium*, and *Viridarium* ; extant in *Fr. Ducaeus*, *Auctuar.* Tom. ii. and in *Cotelier*, *Monum. Eccl.* Gr. Tom. ii.

Thalassius, abbot of a monastery in *Libya*, about AD. 640, wrote several tracts ; namely, *de sincera Charitate*,—*Vitae continentia et mentis regimine*, *sententiarum Hecatontadas* iv. extant in Lat. in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* Tom. xii. and Gr. and Lat. in *Fr. Ducaeus*, *Auctuar.* Tom. ii.

Theodorus, bishop of *Pharan* in *Arabia*, near *Egypt*, a *Eutychian* and *Monothelite* controversial writer, from whose tracts, large extracts occur in the *Acts of the Lateran* and 6th councils ; *Concil.* Tom. vi.

John, archbishop of *Dara* in *Syria*, who has been placed in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries, and perhaps lived about AD. 650, wrote *Commentaries*, in

§ 6. The most distinguished among the Latin writers, were the following. *Ildefonsus* of Toledo, to whom the Spaniards, gratuitously, ascribe certain treatises concerning the virgin *St. Mary*.(22) Two Books of Epistles, by *Desiderius* of Cahors, were edited by *Hen. Canisius*.(23) *Eligius* of Limoges, has left us some *Homilies* and other productions.(24) The *two Books of Ecclesiastical Formulas*, by *Marculphus*, a Gallic monk, help us much to discover the wretched state of religion and learning in this age.(25) The Englishman *Aldhelm* composed various poems, with no great success, on subjects relating to a christian life.(26)

Syriac, on the works of *Dionysius Areopagita*, and on the Apocalypse; extracts from which have been published by *Abr. Echellens*, *Jno. Morin*, and *F. Naiton*.

Basil, bishop of Thessalonica, say some, of Cesarea in Cappadocia, say others; and who flourished perhaps AD. 675; wrote *Scholia* on fifteen Orations of *Gregory Nazianzen*.

Macarius, a Monothelite, patriarch of Antioch, about AD. 680, whose Confession of faith, and extracts from other works, are extant, *Concilia Tom. vi*.

John, archbishop of Thessalonica, AD. 680, has left us one oration, part of another, a fragment of a Hymn, and parts of a Dialogue between a pagan and a christian. *Tr.*]

(22) See the *Acta Sanctor. Januarii Tom. ii p. 535*. [*Ildefonsus* was nobly born at Toledo, educated at Seville, and after being a monk and abbot at Agli, became archbishop of Toledo, AD. 657—667. His 10 spurious homilies and discourses, and one spurious tract, concerning the virgin *Mary*, with one genuine tract on the same subject, were published by *Feuardentius*, Paris 1576; and afterwards in the *Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xii*. We have from his pen, a tract on the ecclesiast. writers, in continuation of *Jerome*, *Gennadius* &c. two Epistles, and a tract de cognitione Baptismi. Several other tracts and letters, and a continuation of *Isidore's* Gothic History, are lost. *Tr.*]

(23) [*Desiderius* was treasurer to *Clothair II*, AD. 614, and bishop of Cahors in France, AD. 629—652. His *First Book* of Epistles, contains those which *Desiderius* wrote to his friends, the *second*, contains those addressed to him. They are extant in *Canisius*, *Lectio. Antiquae*, *Tom. v*. and in *Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. viii*. *Tr.*]

(24) [*Eligius* was born near Limoges, became a goldsmith there, and was esteemed the best workman in all France. In 635, king *Dagobert* sent him as ambassador to Brittany. While a layman, he erected several monasteries and churches. He was bishop of *Noyon*, AD. 640—659; and continued to found monasteries and churches, and besides labored to spread christianity among the Flemings, the Frieslanders, and the Swabians. He has left us a tract de rectitudine Catholicae conversationis, (which has been ascribed to *Augustine*,) and an Epistle to *Desiderius* of Cahors. Of the 16 Homilies ascribed to him, and extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xii*. the greatest part, if not the whole, are supposed to be spurious. They are compilations from the fathers, and several of them bear marks of the 9th and 10th centuries. *Tr.*]

(25) *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, *Tom. iii. p. 565*. [About the year 660, *Marculphus*, then 70 years old, at the request of the bishop of Paris, compiled this book of formulas of different instruments and writings used in ecclesiastical courts, and elsewhere, in the transaction of ecclesiastical affairs, and in the management of church property. It was published Paris 1665 4to, and 1667, by *Baluze*, in *Capitull. Regum Francor. Tom. ii. p. 369*. *Tr.*]

(26) ["This prelate, certainly deserved a more honorable mention than is here made of him by *Dr. Mosheim*. His poetical talents were by no means the most distinguishing part of his character. He was profoundly versed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared also with dignity in the *Paschal* controversy, that so long divided the Saxon and British churches. See *Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. i. p. 121*." *Macl.*—*Aldhelm* was grandson to *Ina*, king of the West Goths. When young he travelled over Gaul and Italy; and pursued

Julianus Promerius confuted the Jews, and has left us some other specimens of his genius, which are neither to be highly praised, nor utterly condemned.(27) To these may be added *Cresconius*,(28) whose *Abridgment of the Canons* is well known, *Fredegarius*,(29) and a few others.(30)

study with such ardor, that he became one of the most learned men of the age. Returning to England, he lived first as a monk, and then for 34 years as the abbot of Malmsbury; afterwards, he was bishop of Sherburne AD. 705—709. *Beda* (Lib. v. c. 19.) says, he was *undecunque doctissimus*. While abbot, he wrote, by request of an English synod, a book in confutation of the sentiments and practice of the ancient Brittons and Scotts in regard to Easter; which is now lost. He also wrote a tract in praise of virginity, both in prose and in verse: likewise a Book on the eight principal virtues; and a 1000 verses of Enigmas. These and some other poems were published at Mayence, 1601, 8vo. and in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xiii. Tr.]

(27) [*Julianus Pomerius*, was bishop of Toledo, AD. 680—690. He wrote commentaries on Joshua; a demonstration that *Christ* has come, against the Jews, in three Books; on death, the place of departed souls, the resurrection and final judgment, three Books; on the discrepancies in the scriptures, two Books; a history of king Wamba's expedition against Paul, the rebel duke of Narbonne; and an Appendix to *Ildefonsus de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* His works are in the 12th vol. of the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tr.]

(28) [*Cresconius* was an African bishop, and flourished AD. 690. His *Breviarium Canonum*, is a methodical Index to the canons of councils and decrees of the Roman pontiffs, digested under 300 heads. He afterwards wrote *Concordia seu Liber Canonum*, which is the same thing, except that the canons and decrees are here recited at length. Both works are in *Voellus*, and *Justell's* Biblioth. Juris Canon. Tr.]

(29) *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, vol. iii. p. 506. [*Fredegarius Scholasticus*, was a Gallic monk, who flourished AD. 640. He compiled a Chronicle, from the creation, to the year of Christ 641, in five Books. The three first Books, which reach to AD. 561, are a compilation from *Julius Africanus*, *Eusebius* as translated by *Jerome*, and others. The fourth Book, comprising AD. 561—584, is an abridgment of *Gregory Turonensis'* History of the Franks. The fifth Book, from 584, to 641, was composed by *Fredegarius*. The Chronicon was afterwards continued by other hands, to AD. 768. The fifth Book is published among the *Scriptores rerum Francicar.* The other Books are, partly in *Canisius*, *Lectiones Antiq.* Tom. ii. and partly in *Gregory Turon. Histor. Francor.* Tr.]

(30) [The following catalogue embraces the Latin writers omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*.

Paterius, pupil of *Gregory* the Great, and bishop of Brescia, about AD. 601. He wrote a Collection of scripture testimonies, in three Books; two from the O. Test. and one from the New:—published with the works of *Gregory* the Great.

Faustus, a monk brought up by *St. Benedict*, and sent into Gaul with *St. Maurus*. He wrote, AD. 606, the life of *St. Maurus*; and the life of *St. Sererinus*. Both are extant in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.* Tom. i.

Marcus, a disciple and companion of *St. Benedict*, and versifier of the life of *Benedict* by *Gregory* the Great: fl. AD. 606.

Boniface IV, pope AD. 606—615, has left us an Epistle to king *Ethelbert* of Kent; and a Synodic Decree: in the Concil. Tom. v.

Bulgaranus, a Spanish Goth, and count, AD. 610. Six of his Epistles, still preserved, have been often consulted, but never published.

Sisebutus, a Gothic king in Spain AD. 612—621. Several of his Epistles are preserved; and likewise his life and martyrdom of *St. Desiderius*.

Boniface V, pope AD. 620—626. His Epistle to *Justus* bishop of Rochester, another to *Edwin* king of Northumberland, and a third to *Edilburg*, Edwin's queen, are extant in *Baronius*, *Annales*, ad ann. 618, and 625, also in the Concil. Tom. v.

Nennius, a British monk, and abbot of Bangor, about AD. 620, and often con-

founded with the Irish *Gildas*. He wrote *de Gestis Britonum Liber*, sive *Breviarium*, or a *History of the Britons*; the MS. of which is still preserved at Westminster and at Cambridge. See *Carc*, Hist. Lit. Tom. i. p. 620.

Honorius, pope, AD. 626—638. He was a monothelite. Eight of his Epistles, which fully prove the fact, are extant, in the Concil. Tom. v. See *Joh. Forbes*, Instruct. Hist. Theolog. Lib. v. and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xx. p. 401, 442 &c. 446 &c.

Braulio, bishop of Saragossa, AD. 627—646. He wrote the life of *St. Aemilian* a monk; which is in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened. Tom. i. also two Epistles to *Isidore* Hispal. and a short Eulogy of *Isidore*, which are published with the works of *Isidore*.

Jonas, an Irish monk, and abbot of *Luxeuil*, flourished about AD. 630. He wrote the Lives of *St. Columbanus* Bobiensis, of *Eustatius* abbot of *Luxeuil*, of *Attala* abbot of *Bobio*, of *Bertulph* abbot of *Bobio*, of *St. John* the founder and abbot of a monastery, and of *St. Fara* or *Burgundofara* first abbess of *York*. Most of these lives are in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedict. Tom. ii.

Cummianus or *Comminus*, surnamed *Fata* or *Fada*, i. e. *tall*, son of *Fiacna* the king of west *Momon*ia in Ireland; born AD. 592, died 661. He was a monk, abbot, and some add bishop in Ireland; and wrote an *Epistle* to *Segienus*, abbot of *Hy*, on the paschal controversy, (in *Usher's* Sylloge Epistolar. Hibernicar. p. 24.) and a Book *de poenitentiarum mensura*, which is in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xii.

John IV, pope AD. 640—641. He wrote an *Epistle* to the Scotch bishops, concerning the paschal controversy; another to the emperor *Constantine III*, in apology for pope *Honorius*; and a third to *Isaac*, bishop of *Syracuse*. These are extant in the Concilia, Tom. v.

Audoenus, or *Dado*, archbishop of *Rouen*, AD. 640—683. He lived to the age of 90, and wrote the life of *St. Eligius* of *Noyon*, in iii Books; published, imperfect, by *Surius*; and perfect, by *L. Dachier*, Spicileg. Tom. v. also an *Epistle*.

Theodorus I, pope, AD. 642—649. He has left us two *Epistles*; in the Concilia, Tom. v, and in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xii.

Eugenius, archbishop of *Toledo*, AD. 646—657. He composed some tracts, in verse and prose, which are extant in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xii.

Tajo or *Tago*, bishop of *Saragossa*, flourished AD. 646. He was a great admirer of the works of *Gregory* the Great; went to *Rome* to obtain copies of them; and compiled five Books of *Sentences*, from them.

Martin I, pope, AD. 649—655. For his opposition to a decree of the emperor *Constans*, called his *Typus*, *Martin* was seized by an armed force, in 653, carried prisoner to *Constantinople*, kept in jail a long time, tried, and banished. He ended his days at *Cherson*, an exile. Seventeen of his *Epistles* are extant; 11 of them, Gr. and Lat. are in the Concil. Tom. vi.

Anastasius, deacon and apocrisiarius of the Romish church. He adhered to *St. Maximus*, and shared in his fortunes. The year before his death, AD. 665; he wrote a long letter, giving account of the sufferings and exile of himself, *Maximus*, and *Anastasius* patriarch of *Constantinople*, and defending their tenets in opposition to the *Monothelites*. It is in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xii. and also prefixed to the works of *St. Maximus*.

Fructuosus, of royal Gothic blood, bishop of *Braga*, AD. 656—675. He was founder of many monasteries, and particularly that of *Alcala*: and drew up two *Rules* for monks, one in twenty three chapters, the other in twenty. Both are published by *Lu. Holstenius*, Codex Regular. Pt. ii.

Vitalianus, pope, AD. 657—671. In the year 668, he and *Maurus* the archbishop of *Ravenna*, mutually excommunicated each other. Six of his *Epistles* are in the Concilior. Tom. vi.

Syricius, bishop of *Barcelona*, about AD. 657. He wrote two *Epistles*, which are extant in *Lu. Dachier*, Spicileg. Tom. i. or, new ed. Tom. iii.

Cummeneus, surnamed *Albus*; an Irish monk, and abbot of *Hy*, AD. 657—669. He wrote the life of *St. Columba*, the first abbot of *Hy*; which may be seen in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened. Tom. i.

Jonas, a disciple of *St. Columbanus*, and an abbot somewhere. He wrote, about AD. 664, the life and miracles of *St. John*, abbot *Reomaënsis*, in ii Books. The latter Book is in *Mabillon*, Acta &c. Tom. i.

Theodorus, a native of *Tarsus* in *Cilicia*, whom the pope made archbishop of

Canterbury AD. 668. He was a man of learning, and very efficient in action. Introducing a fine library of Greek and Latin works into England, he gave an impulse to learning among the Anglo-Saxon clergy. He also did much to bring the British and Scotch clergy to adopt the Roman method of keeping Easter. His only work, except an epistle, is his *Poenitentiale*, or directory for dealing with offenders in the church.

Agatho, pope, AD. 680—681, has left us three Epistles; which are in the Concilia, Tom. vi.

Adamnanus or *Adamannus*, a Scotch-Irish monk, and abbot of Hy, AD. 679—704. He was very active in bringing the Scotch and Irish to adopt the Roman practice respecting Easter. His life of St. Columbanus, in 3 Books, is given by *Canisius* and *Surius*; and his topographical description of Jerusalem and other sacred places, as he learned them from *Arculphus* a Gallic bishop and traveller, in 3 Books, was published by *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened. secul. iii. Pt. ii. or Tom. iv. p. 456—472.

Ceolfrid, abbot of Weremuth or Wiremuth, in England, about AD. 680, and preceptor to *Beda*. He visited Rome; obtained of pope Sergius, privileges for his monastery; and brought home books for the use of his monks. A long Epistle of his to *Naiton*, king of the Picts, in defence of the Roman method of keeping Easter, is extant in *Beda*. L. v. c. 22, and in the Concilia, Tom. vi.

Aphonius, very little known, but supposed to have lived about AD. 680, wrote a Commentary on the Canticles, in vi Books; which is extant in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. xiv.

Valerius, a Spanish monk and abbot in Gallicia, about AD. 680. His life of *St Fructuosus*, is extant in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened. Tom. ii. Some other lives and treatises exist in MS.

Leo II, pope, AD. 682—684. Five Epistles ascribed to him, are extant in the Concilia, Tom. vi. But *Baronius* and others think them spurious, because they represent pope *Honorius* to have been a Monothelite.

Benedict II, pope, AD. 684—686. He has two Epistles in the Concilia, Tom. vi.

Bobolenus, a monk and presbyter, who probably lived about AD. 690. He wrote the life of *St. Germanus*, first abbot Grandivallensis, in the bishopric of Basle, who was slain about AD. 666: extant in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened. Tom. ii. Tr.]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Miserable state of Religion.—§ 2. Expositors of the scriptures.—§ 3. Dogmatic theology.—§ 4. Practical theology.—§ 5. Renewal of penitential discipline.—§ 6. State of polemic theology.

§ 1. During this century, true religion lay buried under a senseless mass of superstitions; and was unable to raise her head. The earlier christians had worshipped only God, and his son; but those called christians in this age, worshipped the wood of a cross, the images of holy men, and bones of dubious origin.(1) The early christians placed heaven and hell before the view of men; these latter depicted a certain fire prepared to burn off the imperfections of the soul. The former taught, that *Christ* had made expiation for the sins of men, by his death and his blood; the latter seemed to inculcate, that the gates of heaven would be closed against none, who should enrich the clergy or the church with their donations.(2) The former were studious to maintain a holy simplicity, and to follow a pure and chaste piety; the latter placed the substance of religion in external rites and bodily exercises. Did any one hesitate to believe? Two irrefragible arguments were at hand; *the authority*

(1) I will here quote a passage, well calculated to illustrate the piety of this age, taken from the Life of *St. Eligius*, bishop of Noyon, in *Lu. Dachier's Spicilegium veter. Scriptor. Tom. ii. p. 92*. "*The Lord conferred upon this most holy man, among other miraculous gifts, that, while searching and praying after them, with the most ardent faith, the bodies of the holy martyrs, which had lain concealed for so many ages, were discovered.*" This most successful carcass-hunter of saints, therefore, discovered the bodies of *Quintin, Piato, Crispin, Crispinian, Lucian*, and many others; as his biographer minutely narrates. Such ability to find the concealed bones of saints and martyrs, was claimed by most of the bishops, who wished to be esteemed by the people, and to amass riches.

(2) *St. Eligius*, a great man of this age, says, (in *Dachier, Spicilegium, Tom. ii. p. 96*.) "*He is a good christian, who comes often to church, and brings his offering to be laid on the altar of God; who does not taste of his produce, till he has first offered some of it to God; who, as often as the holy solemnities return, keeps himself for some days before, pure even from his own wife, so that he may come to the altar of God with a safe conscience; and who finally has committed to memory the Creed, or the Lord's Prayer.—Redeem your souls from punishment, while ye have the means in your power—present oblations and tithes to the churches, bring candles to the holy places, according to your wealth—and come often to the church, and beg suppliantly for the intercession of the saints. If ye do these things, ye may come with confidence, before the tribunal of the eternal God, in the day of judgment, and say: Give, Lord, for we have given.*" ["We see here a large and ample description of the character of a good christian, in which there is not the least mention of the love of God, resignation to his will, obedience to his laws, or justice, benevolence, and charity towards men; and in which the whole of religion is made to consist in coming often to the church, bringing offerings to the altar, lighting candles in consecrated places, and such like vain services." *Macl.*]

of the church, and miracles; for the working of which in these times of ignorance, but a moderate share of dexterity was requisite.

§ 2. Few, either of the Greeks or Latins, applied themselves to the interpretation of the holy scriptures. There remain some commentaries of *Isichius* of Jerusalem, on certain books of the Old Testament, and on the epistle to the Hebrews. *Maximus* composed *sixty-five Questions on the holy scriptures*, and some other works of like character. *Julianus Pomerius* showed his wish, and his inability, to reconcile passages of scripture between which there is apparent contradiction, and also to explain the prophecy of Nahum. Compared with these writers, the worst of modern interpreters are manifestly to be preferred. The Greeks, especially those who would be thought adepts in mystic theology, ran after fantastic allegories; as may be seen by the *Questions* of *Maximus* above mentioned. The Latins had too little self-confidence even to venture on such a course, and therefore only culled flowers from the works of *Gregory* and *Augustine*; as is manifest, among other works, from the *Explanations of the Old and New Testament* collected by *Paterius* from the works of *Gregory* the Great.(3) *Thomas* of Heraclea gave to the Syrians a new translation of the New Testament.(4)

§ 3. As among the Latins, philosophy was nearly extinct, and among the Greeks, only certain points of theology were brought under discussion, no one thought of reducing the doctrines of religion to a regular system, and of stating them philosophically. Yet one *Antiochus*, a monk of Palestine, composed a short summary of religious doctrines, which he called *The Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*. But the rank and influence due to this author, may be inferred from the mournful verses subjoined to this work, in which the author deplores in sorrowful strains the loss of the wood of the [true] cross, which the Persians were said to have carried away. A more neat and judicious Latin summary of the theology of this age, has not come down to us, than that in *Ildefonsus'* book *de Cognitione Baptismi*, lately brought to light by *Baluze*;—a work indeed which we do not need, but one that contains some valuable testimonies for truths which were afterwards discarded.(5) *Tajb* or *Tajo*, bishop of Saragossa,

(3) This useless performance has been usually printed with the works of *Gregory* the Great; and therefore the Benedictine monks inserted it in their recent and splendid edition of *Gregory's* works, vol. iv. Pt. ii. but with no advantage to the public.

(4) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. ii. p. 93, 94.

(5) See *Baluze*, Miscellanea, Tom. vi. p. 1 &c. From this book, it clearly appears, among other things, that the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, as it is called, was unknown to the Latins in the 7th century, (ch. 137. pa. 99.)—that the sacred volume was read by all christians, (ch. 80. p. 59)—and other facts of the

compiled *five Books of Sentences*, which are a dry and insipid body of theoretical and practical divinity, taken from *Gregory the Great*, though *Augustine* is sometimes taxed for contributions: yet that age esteemed it an admirable performance, and deserving immortality.(6) On certain parts of christianity, a few individuals employed their pens; as *Maximus*, who wrote *on theology*, and *on the manifestation of the Son in the flesh*, and likewise *on the two natures in Christ*; and *Theodorus* of Raithu, who wrote *on the incarnation of Christ*. But those acquainted with the character of that age, will easily conjecture what sort of doctors these were.

§ 4. The lamentable state of practical theology, is manifest from every writer on the subject in this age. The best of them were, *Dorotheus*, in his *Ascetic Dissertations*, *Maximus* and *Aldhelm*, in some tracts, *Hesychius*, and *Thalasius*, in their *Sentences*, and a few others. But in these, how many and how great are the imperfections! how numerous the marks of superstition! what constant indications of a mind vacillating and unable to grasp the subject! The laity, as they were called, had no cause to tax their teachers with excessive severity. For it was customary to confine the obligations of men to a very few virtues; as is manifest from *Aldhem's* tract *on the eight principal vices*. And those who neglected these duties, were to incur no very formidable punishment for their offences. A life of solitude, as practised by the monks, though adorned by no marks of true piety, was esteemed sufficient of itself to atone for all kinds of guilt; and it was therefore called, by the Latins, a *second Baptism*.(7) This one fact is sufficient to show, how little the precepts of *Christ* were understood in this age. Among the swarms of Greek and oriental monks, very many labored to attain perfection, by means of contemplation; and these endeavored to transfuse into their very natures, the spirit of *Dionysius*, that father of the mystics.

§ 5. *Theodorus* the Cilician, a Grecian monk, restored among the Latins the discipline of *penance*, as it is called, which had fallen into neglect, and enforced it by strict rules, borrowed from the

like nature. *Ildefonsus* carefully excludes philosophy and reason as authorities in religion; and teaches that there are two sources of theology, namely the holy scriptures, and the writings of the ancient doctors, or as he expresses himself (p. 14, 22,) *divinae institutionis auctoritatem, et sacrae paternitatis antiquitatem*.

(6) See *Jo. Mabillon*, *Analecta veteris Aevi*, Tom. ii. p. 68 &c.

(7) [See *Harduin's Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 1771, where, in the Capitula of *Theodore* of Canterbury, we read: *At the ordination of monks*, the abbot ought to say mass, and utter three prayers over his head; and the monk should veil his head with a cowl seven days; and on the 7th day the abbot should remove the veil from the monk's head. As in baptism the presbyter removes the infant's veil on the 7th day, so should the abbot do to the monk: for it is a *second Baptism*, according to the decision of the fathers; and all sins are forgiven, as in Baptism. *Schl.*]

Grecian ecclesiastical jurisprudence. This man, being unexpectedly raised to the see of Canterbury in England, AD 668, among many other laudable deeds, reduced to a regular system, that part of ecclesiastical law which is called *disciplina poenitentiaria*. For, by publishing his Penitential, a work of which kind the Latin world had never before seen, he taught the priests to discriminate between more heinous and lighter sins, and between such as were secret and such as were open, and likewise to measure and to estimate them according to the circumstances of time, place, the character and disposition of the sinner, his sorrow &c. and pointed out the punishment due to the several kinds of sins and faults, the proper modes of consoling, admonishing, and absolving, and in short, marked out the whole duty of those who hear confessions.(8) This new discipline of penance, though it was of Grecian origin, was very acceptable to the Latins; and in a short time, it was diffused from Britain over the whole Latin world, and enforced by Penitentials drawn up after the pattern of the original one by *Theodorus*. Yet it gradually declined again, in the eighth century, and by the new system of what are called *indulgences*, was at length wholly subverted.

§ 6. Those who wrote against the religious sects that departed from the common faith, are scarcely worthy of being named; and they would not be worth reading, were it not that they serve to elucidate the history of their times. Against the pagans, *Nicias* composed two Books;(9) and *Photius* mentions a person unknown to us, who he says, contended against them, with a great array of arguments drawn from the fathers.(10) Against the Jews, contended *Julianus Pomerius*. All the heresies are described and assailed, in the little work of *Timotheus*, on the Reception of Heretics. Of the theological contests among the orthodox themselves, little can be said. In this age, were scattered the seeds of those grievous contests, which afterwards severed the Greeks from the Latins; nor were they merely scattered, but likewise took root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman domination appeared altogether insufferable. In Britain, the ancient christians of that country contended with the new or Romish christians, that is, of the Saxon race, whom *Augustine* converted to *Christ*. They contended respecting various things; as baptism, and the tonsure, but especially about the time for the celebration of the feast of Easter.(11) But these controversies did

(8) The Penitential of *Theodorus*, is still extant, though mutilated; published by *Ja. Petit*, Paris 1679, 4to. with learned Dissertations and notes. We have also the one hundred and twenty *Capitula ecclesiastica* of the same *Theodorus*, in *Dachier*, *Spicilegium*, Tom. ix. *Harduin*, *Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 1771, and elsewhere.

(9) [Of this man, nothing more is known, than that he was a monk, and that he wrote a book against the seven chapters of *Philoponus*. *Schl.*]

(10) *Photius*, *Biblioth. Codex clxx.* p. 379.

(11) *Cummanus*' Epistle, in *Ja. Usher's Sylloge epistolar. Hibernicar.* p

not relate to religion itself; and they were settled and determined, in the eighth century, by the Benedictine monks, and in accordance with the views of the Romans.(12)

23 &c. *Beda*, *Historia Eccles. gentis Anglor.* Lib. iii. c. 25. *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Britann.* Tom. i. p. 37, 42. *Acta Sanctor. Februarii*, Tom. iii. p. 21, 84. [See also Dr. *Warner's Ecclesiastical History of England*, Book ii and iii. *Macl.*]

(12) *Jo. Mabillon*, *Praef. ad Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.* Tom. iii. p. ii &c.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied.—§ 2. Some examples.

§ 1. The Greeks, in the council which is called *Quinisextum*, made various enactments respecting religious rites and forms of worship, in which there were several deviations from the Roman usage. These canons were publicly received in all the churches, within the territories of the Greek emperors; and likewise by all churches, which accorded in doctrine and worship with the Greeks, though situated in the dominions of barbarian kings.(1) Nearly all the Roman pontiffs likewise added something new to the ancient ceremonies; as if they had supposed, that no one could teach christianity with success, unless he could delight a christian assembly with rare shows and mummary. These rights and usages were in the time of *Charlemagne*, propagated from Rome among the other Latin churches; for the arrogance of the pontiffs would not suffer them to deviate from the Roman usage.

§ 2. A few specimens may serve for examples. The number of festivals, which was already oppressively great, was increased by the addition of a day consecrated to the wood of the cross on which the Savior hung;(2) and another to the commemoration of his ascent to heaven.(3) *Boniface V*, invested the churches

(1) [This council was held at Constantinople, AD. 692, and was composed chiefly of oriental bishops, of whom more than 200 were assembled. The place of the sessions was a hall in the imperial palace, called *Trullus*; whence the council was denominated *Concilium Trullanum*, and *Concilium in Trullo*. It was properly the seventh *General Council*, and supplied canons for the church, which the fifth and sixth had neglected to make. Being thus a kind of *supplement* to the fifth and sixth general Councils, it was called *Concilium Quinisextum*. See chap. v. § 12. below. *Tr.*]

(2) This festival was instituted by the emperor *Heraclius*, in the year 631, after he had vanquished the Persians and recovered from them the real cross, which *Cosroes* their king had carried off fourteen years before. The festival was established by pope *Honorius*; and was introduced into the West in this century. For the Roman pontiffs were then under the dominion of the Greek emperors, and were beginning gradually to withdraw themselves from their jurisdiction. The earliest mention of this festival, which the Greeks call *εαυροστάσια* [and the Latins, *exaltatio crucis*, kept. Sept 14. See *Barontus*, *Annales*, ad ann. 628. *Tr.*] occurs in the *Collatio* of St. *Maximus* with *Theodosius*, bishop of *Cesarea*, AD. 650. See *Baumgarten's* *Erläuterung der christl. Alterthümer*, p. 310. *Schl.*]

(3) [It is to be wished, that *Dr. Mosheim* had here given his authority for placing the origin of the feast of Ascension in this century. Among the fifty days next following Easter, this festival had been observed by the christians, with peculiar solemnity, ever since the *fourth* century: as may be inferred from *Au-*

with those rights of asylum, which afforded to all villains a licence to commit crimes without much danger.(4) The art of ornamenting churches magnificently, was perfected with great diligence by *Honorius*.(5) For, as neither *Christ* nor his apostles had enjoined any thing on this subject, it was but reasonable that their vicar should confer this favor on mankind. Of the sacerdotal garments, and the rest of the apparatus, which was deemed necessary in the celebration of the Lord's supper, and for giving dignity and grandeur to the assemblies for public worship, I shall say nothing.

gustine, Epist. 118 ad Januar. *Chrysostom*, Homil. 62. Tom. vii, and Homil. 35. Tom. v. Constitutiones Apostol. L. viii. c. 33. L. v. c. 19, and especially from the Concil. Agathense, AD. 506. where the 21st Canon says: Pascha, Natale Domini, Epiphania, *Ascensionem Domini*, Pentecosten et natalem S. Johannis Baptistae, vel si qui maximi dies in festivitatibus habentur, nonnisi in civitatibus aut in parochiis teneant. (*Harduin*, Tom. ii. p. 1000.) Instead of this festival, might be mentioned the *Feast of All Saints*, as originating in this century, under pope *Boniface*. In the eastern churches, it had indeed been observed ever since the 4th century, on the eighth day after Whitsunday, and was called the Feast of all the Martyrs. But in the western churches, it had the following origin. *Boniface*, in the year 610, obtained by gift, the Pantheon at Rome, and consecrated it to the honor of the virgin *Mary* and all the martyrs; as it had before been sacred to all the gods, and particularly to *Cybele*. On this occasion, he ordered the feast of all the apostles, to be kept on the 1st of May, which was afterwards assigned only to *Philip* and *James*; and the feast of all the martyrs, on the 12th of May. But this last feast being frequented by a large concourse of people, *Gregory* iv, in the year 834, transferred it to a season of the year when provisions were more easily obtained, that is, to the first day of November; and also consecrated it to *All Saints*. See *Baumgarten's* christl. Alterthuemer, p. 313. Schl.]

(4) [Temples were anciently, even among pagans, places of safety for valuable goods, and for men in times of war or oppression. Among the christians, at first, only the altar and the choir enjoyed this privilege. Afterwards the nave of the church, and finally the whole inclosure participated in it. All persons under prosecution, whether in civil or criminal causes, might there be secure till their case was investigated. But public debtors, Jews, runaway slaves, robbers, murderers, banditti, and adulterers, were prohibited by law from this right of sanctuary. Yet in the western churches, this right of asylum degenerated into a source of the most shocking disorders; and to them this regulation of *Boniface*, especially, gave the occasion. *Anastasius* Bibliothecarius says of him: *He ordained, that no person, who had taken refuge in a church, should be delivered up.* Schl.]

(5) [See *Anastasius*, in his Life of this pontiff. He says of him, among other things, that he covered the Confessional of St. Peter with pure silver, which weighed 187 pounds. He overlaid the great doors at the entrance of the church, which were called *Medianae*, with silver weighing 975 pounds. He also made two large silver candlesticks, of equal dimensions, weighing each 62 pounds. He likewise made for the church of St. Andrews, a silver table before the Confessional, as above, which weighed 73 pounds. &c. Schl.]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES.

§ 1, 2. Remains of the earlier sects.— § 3. Nestorians and Monophysites.— § 4. Monothelites.— § 5. Their prosperous circumstances.— § 6. Their adversities.— § 7. Contests arising out of the *ἐκδήσις* and the *εὐρωγ*.— § 8. The sixth general council.— § 9. Sum of the controversy.— § 10. Different opinions among that sect.— § 11. Their condition after the council of Constantinople.— § 12. The council called *Quinisextum*.

§ 1. The Greeks, during this century, and especially in the reigns of *Constans*, *Constantine* Pogonatus, and *Justinian* II. were engaged in fierce combat with the *Paulicians*; whom they considered as a branch of the Manichaeans, and who lived in Armenia and the adjacent countries. The Greeks assailed them, not only with arguments, but still more with military force, and with legal enactments and penalties. For one *Constantine*, during the reign of *Constans*, had resuscitated this sect, which was then exhausted and ready to become extinct; and had propagated its doctrines with great success.(1) But the history of this sect, which is said to have originated from two brothers, *Paul* and *John*, will be stated more explicitly under the ninth century, at which time its conflicts with the Greeks came to an open and bloody war.

§ 2. In Italy, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the *Arians* to the doctrines of the Nicene council. In Gaul and in England, the *Pelagian* and *Semi-Pelagian* controversies still produced some disquietude. In the East, the ancient sects, which the imperial laws had repressed, but had by no means subdued and extinguished, assumed courage, in several places, and were able to secure adherents. Fear of the laws and of punishment, induced these sects to seek a temporary concealment; but when the power of their foes was somewhat abridged, they again resumed courage.

§ 3. The condition of the *Nestorians* and *Monophysites*, under those new lords of the East, the Saracens, was far happier, than before that conquest; indeed, while the Greeks were oppressed and banished, both these sects were every where preferred before them. *Jesujabus*, the sovereign pontiff of the Nestorians, concluded a treaty first with *Muhammed*, and afterwards with *Omar*, and obtained many advantages for his sect.(2)

(1) *Photius*, contra Manichaeos, Lib i. p. 61. *Peter Siculus*, Historia Manichaeor. p. 41 &c. *George Cedrenus*, Compend. Histor. p. 431. ed. Venice.

(2) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana, Tom iii. Pt. ii. p. xciv &c.

There is likewise extant an *injunction*, or *Testament*, as it is commonly called, that is, a diploma, of *Muhammed* himself, in which he promises full security to all christians living under his dominion: and though some learned men doubt the authenticity of this instrument, yet the Muhammedans do not call it in question.(3) The successors of *Muhammed* in Persia, employed the Nestorians in the most important affairs and business both of the court and of the provinces; nor would they suffer any patriarch, except the one who governed this sect, to reside in the kingdom of Babylon.(4) The Monophysites, in Egypt and Syria, were equally fortunate. In Egypt, *Amru* having taken Alexandria in the year 644, directed *Benjamin*, the Monophysite pontiff, to occupy the see of Alexandria; and from that time, for nearly a century, the Melchites, or those who followed the opinions of the Greek church, had no prelate.(5)

§ 4. Among the Greeks, who were otherwise greatly distracted, there arose a new sect, in the year 630, during the reign of *Heraclius*, which soon produced such commotions, that both the East and the West united to put it down. An ill-timed effort at

(3) This famous *Testament* of Muhammed was brought into Europe from the East, in the 17th century, by *Pacificus Scaliger*, a Capuchin monk; and first published, Arabic and Latin, by *Gabriel Sionita*, Paris 1630; and afterwards, the Lutherans, *John Fabricius*, AD. 1638, and *Hinckelmann*, AD. 1690, published it in Latin. See *Jo. Henr. Hottinger*, *Histor. Oriental. Lib. ii. c. 20. p. 237.* *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. xcv.* *Renaudot*, *Histor. Patriarchar. Alexandr. p. 168.* Those who, with *Grotius*, reject this Testament, suppose it was fabricated by the monks living in Syria and Arabia, to circumvent their hard masters, the Muhammedans. Nor is the supposition incredible. For the monks of mount Sinai, formerly, showed a similar edict of *Muhammed*, which they said he drew up while a private man; an edict exceedingly favorable to them, and beyond all controversy, fraudulently drawn up by themselves. The fraud was sufficiently manifest; yet the Muhammedans, a people destitute of all erudition, believed it was a genuine ordinance of their prophet, and they believe so still. This imposition is treated of by *Demetr. Cantimir*, *Histoire de l' Empire Ottoman, Tome ii. p. 269 &c.* The argument therefore, which *Renaudot* and others draw, in favor of the Testament in question, from the acknowledgment of its authenticity by the Muhammedans, is of little weight; because, in things of this nature, no people could be more easily imposed upon, than the rude and illiterate Muhammedans. Nor is the argument of more force, which the opposers of the Testament draw from the difference of its style from that of the *Koran*. For it is not necessary to suppose, that *Muhammed* himself composed this Testament: he might have employed his secretary. But however dubious the Testament itself may be, the subject matter of it is not doubtful. For learned men have proved, by powerful arguments, that *Muhammed* originally would allow no injury to be offered to the christians, and especially to the Nestorians.—[This Testament is a formal compact, between *Muhammed* on the one part, and the Nestorians and Monophysites, on the other. He promises to them his protection; and they promise to him loyalty and obedience. He promises them entire religious freedom; and they promise him support against his enemies. *Muhammed* might have deemed it sound policy to conclude such a treaty with these sectaries; that, by their aid, he might subdue the countries of Asia subject to the Greek emperors. *Schl.*]

(4) *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. Tom. iii. Pt. ii. p. xcvi &c.* *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor. p. 163, 169.*

(5) *Euseb Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor. p. 168*

peace, produced war. The emperor *Heraclius*, considering the immense evils resulting to the Greek empire from the revolt of the Nestorians to the Persians, was exceedingly desirous of reconciling the *Monophysites* to the Greek church, lest the empire should receive a new wound by their departure from it. He therefore, during his war with the Persians, first had a conference, in the year 622, with one *Paul*, a principal man among the Armenian Monophysites; and afterwards, in the year 629, at Hierapolis, with *Anastasius*, the *Catholicus* or patriarch of the Monophysites; respecting the means of restoring harmony. Both of them suggested to the emperor, that the believers in one nature of *Christ*, might be induced to receive the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and be reconciled to the Greeks; provided, the Greeks would admit and profess, that in *Jesus Christ, after the union of the two natures, there was but one will, and one voluntary operation*. *Heraclius* stated what he had learned from these men, to *Sergius* the patriarch of Constantinople, who was a native of Syria, and descended from parents that were Monophysites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that it might be held and inculcated, without prejudice to the truth, or to the authority of the council of Chalcedon, that, after the union of two natures in *Christ*, there was but one will, and one operation of will. *Heraclius*, therefore, in order to terminate the discord both in church and state, issued a decree, in the year 630, that this faith should be received and taught.(6)

§ 5. At first the affair seemed to go on well. For, although some refused to comply with the imperial edict, yet the two patriarchs of the East, *Cyrus* of Alexandria, and *Athanasius* of Antioch, did not hesitate to obey the will of the emperor: and the see of Jerusalem was then vacant.(7) The consent of the Latin patriarch, or of the Roman pontiff, was perhaps not deemed necessary, in an affair which related so exclusively to the oriental church. *Cyrus*, whom the emperor had promoted from the see of Phasis to that of Alexandria, held a council, by the seventh decree of which, the doctrine of *Monothelism*, which the emperor wished to have introduced, was solemnly confirmed.(8) And this modification of the decree of Chalcedon was

(6) The writers who give account of this sect, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Graeca, vol. x. p. 204. The account which I have given, in the text, is derived from the original sources, and rests on the most explicit testimony. [The most important of the ancient documents, are found in the Acts of the council of the Lateran AD. 649, and in those of the sixth general council, held at Constantinople AD. 681, 682. Among the modern writers, the most full and candid, is *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ix. p. 3—667. See also *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. vol. xx. p. 346—453. and *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, from *Honorius* on to the end of this century. Tr.]

(7) See *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, Tom. iii. p. 264.

(8) [The documents of this council are in *Harduin's* Concilia, Tom. iii. p. 1327 &c. The intention of *Cyrus* was good. He wished to gain over the Se-

so influential with the Monothelites in Egypt, Armenia, and other provinces, that a great part of them returned to the church. They seem however to have explained the doctrine of *one will* in Christ, which was certainly equivocal, according to their own views, and not according to the general sentiments of their sect.

§ 6. But this fair prospect of peace and harmony, was blasted, and a formidable contest was excited, by a single monk of Palestine, named *Sophronius*. He being present at the council of Alexandria, held by Cyrus in the year 633, strenuously resisted the article which related to *one will* in Christ. And the next year, 634, being made patriarch of Jerusalem, he assembled a council, in which he condemned the *Monothelites*; and maintained, that, by their doctrine the *Eutychian* error, respecting the amalgamation and confusion of natures in Christ, was revived and brought into the church. He drew over many, particularly among the monks, to his sentiments; and he made special efforts to gain over *Honorius* the Roman pontiff to his side.(9) But *Sergius* of Constantinople wrote a long and discreet letter to *Honorius*, which induced him to decide, that those held sound doctrine who taught, that there was *one will* and *one operation* in Christ.(10)

verians and the Theodosians, who composed a large part of the christians of Alexandria; and he considered the doctrine of *one will* and *one operation*, as the best means for this end. He therefore, in several canons, spoke of *one single theandric operation* in Christ, (ὁὶὸν ἐνεργῶντα τὰ θεοπεπῆ καὶ ἀνδρώπῆα μιᾷ θεανδρῆ ἐνεργίᾳ,) yet, for the sake of peace, he refrained from affirming either *one*, or *two wills and operations*. This step, though taken with the best intentions, gave occasion afterwards to the most violent theological contests. *Schl.*]

(9) [*Sophronius* was most sincere and decorous in his opposition to the doctrine of *Monothelism*. In the council of Alexandria, he fell down before *Cyrus*, and entreated him, not to sanction such a doctrine. But he was alone in his opposition. *Cyrus* treated him tenderly, advised him to confer with *Sergius* the patriarch of Constantinople on the subject, and wrote a letter to *Sergius* for *Sophronius* to carry. When arrived at Constantinople, *Sergius* endeavored to soothe him, represented the point as unessential, agreed to write to *Cyrus* not to allow any controversy on the subject, but to leave every one at full liberty to speculate as he pleased about it. *Sophronius* now agreed to keep silence. But when made patriarch of Jerusalem, his conscience would not let him rest. Whether he assembled a provincial synod, as *Dr. Mosheim* asserts, is questionable. But his circular epistle to the other patriarchs on occasion of his consecration, contained an elaborate discussion of the subject, and a host of quotations from the fathers, in proof that the doctrine of *two wills* and *two operations* was the only true doctrine. See the letter in *Harduin's Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 1257. Tr.]

(10) This the adherents to the Roman pontiffs have taken the utmost pains to disprove, lest one of the pontiffs should seem to have erred in a matter of such moment. See, among many others, *Jo. Harduin*, de Sacramento altaris, in his *Opp. selecta*, p. 255 &c. And indeed, it is not difficult either to accuse or excuse the man. For he appears not to have known, what he did think, on the subject, and to have annexed no very definite ideas to the words which he used. Yet he *did* say, that there was but *one will* and *one operation of will* in Christ. And for this, he was condemned in the council of Constantinople. He was therefore, a *heretic*, beyond all controversy, if it be true that universal councils cannot err. See *Ja. Benign. Bossuet*, Defensio declarationis quam clerus Gallicanus,

Hence arose severe contests, which divided the commonwealth, as well as the church into two parties.

§ 7. To quiet these great commotions, *Heraclius* published, in the year 639, an *Ecthesis*, drawn up by *Sergius*, that is, a formula of faith; in which, while he forbid all discussion of the question, whether there were *only one*, or a *twofold action or operation in Christ*, he clearly stated, that there was but *one will* in Christ.(11) This new law was approved by not a few, in the East, and first of all by *Pyrrhus* of Constantinople, who on the death of *Sergius*, succeeded to that see in the year 639.(12) But the Roman pontiff *John IV*, in a council held this year at Rome, rejected the *Ecthesis*, and condemned the Monothelites.(13)

Anno 1682, de potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit, P. ii. Lib. xii. cap. 21 &c. p. 182 &c. Add *Ja Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, Tom. i. p. 391 &c. [*Honorius* was made acquainted, by *Sergius*, in the above mentioned letter, with the origin and whole progress of the controversy; and he was so impressed, that, in his answer to *Sergius*, (which is in *Harduin's Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 1319 &c.) he so far agreed with *Sergius*, that he would not have either *one* or *two operations* and divine *wills* affirmed; yet he did very clearly maintain but *one will* in Christ, expressed his disapprobation of *Sophronius*, and declared the whole controversy to be unimportant and mere logomachy. There is extant also, (ibid. p. 1351.) an extract from a second letter of *Honorius* to *Sergius*, in which he still farther confirms his opinion. The friends of the Romish church have taken great pains to justify this mistake of *Honorius*. The Acts of the sixth general council, say they, are corrupted, and the name of *Honorius* has been wickedly foisted into them. *Honorius* was not condemned for *Heresy*, but for his *forbearance*. He meant to deny only that there were two *opposite* wills in Christ. He wrote only as a private person, and not as a bishop, and also when ill informed by *Sergius*; and moreover retracted afterwards his opinion. But even catholic writers have confuted these subterfuges: e. g. *Richer*, Hist. Concil. general. p. 296 &c. *Du Pin*, Biblioth. Tom. vi. p. 67 &c. *Honorius* was condemned, not only in the 6th general council, but also in the 7th and 8th, and in that in Trullo, and likewise by his own successors (*Agatho*, *Leo II*, *Hadrian* &c.) and is named in several Rituals, and particularly in the Breviary, and in the festival of *Leo II*, together with *Sergius* and *Cyrus*, as a person *damnatae memoriae*. This is manifest proof, that no one then, even thought of an infallibility in the Romish popes, notwithstanding in modern times, the name of *Honorius* has been erased from the Breviaries. *Schl.* See *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, (*Agatho*,) vol. iii. Tr.]

(11) [This *Ecthesis* is in *Harduin's Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 791 &c. *Schl.*]

(12) [Previously to this, *Sergius* assembled the clergy at Constantinople, and not only established the new Concordat, but ordained that all clergymen who should not adopt it should be liable to deposition, and all monks and laymen be liable to excommunication. Extracts from the Acts of this council are given in the Acts of the Lateran council [AD. 649,] in *Harduin*, Tom. iii. p. 795 &c. *Pyrrhus*, the successor of *Sergius*, likewise received this formula, in an assembly of the clergy AD. 640, and commanded all bishops, whether present or absent, to subscribe to it. See the extracts from the Acts of this council, in *Harduin*, Tom. iii. p. 797. *Schl.*]

(13) [*Heraclius* transmitted the *Ecthesis* to pope *Severinus* at Rome, by the exarch *Isaaci*. (*Harduin*, Tom. iii. p. 803.) Whether *Severinus* submitted to it, is uncertain. But that his envoys, sent to Constantinople to obtain the confirmation of his election, could not succeed, till they had engaged he should receive it, is certain. His successor, *John IV*, rejected it, soon after his elevation to office, in a Romish council, of which we have only very dubious accounts. On the side of this pope, stood the island of Cyprus, and Numidia, Byzicene, the Provincia Proconsularis, and Mauritania; from all of which provinces, synodal epistles are still extant, which shew that the bishops there passed resolutions against the *Ecthesis*. They are in *Harduin's Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 727 &c. *Schl.*]

As the controversy still continued, the emperor *Constans*, in the year 648, published, with the consent of *Paul* of Constantinople, a new edict, called the *Typus*; by which the *Ecthesis* was annulled, and silence enjoined on both the contending parties, as well with regard to *one will*, as with regard to *one operation of will* in Christ.(14) But by the impassioned monks, silence was viewed as a crime: and by their instigation, *Martin* the bishop of Rome, in a council of 105 bishops, in the year 649, anathematized both the *Ecthesis* and the *Typus*, (but without naming the emperors,) and likewise all patrons of the *Monothelites*.(15)

§ 8. The audacity of *Martin*, in anathematizing the imperial edicts, provoked *Constans* to issue orders for the arrest of the pontiff, by the exarch *Calliopas*, and for his transportation, in the year 650, to the island of Naxia. *Maximus*, the ring-leader of the seditious monks, was banished to Bizyca; and others, not less factious, were punished in different ways.(16) The succeeding Roman pontiffs, *Eugenius* and *Vitalianus*, were more discreet and moderate; especially the latter, who received *Constans*, upon his arrival at Rome, in the year 663, with the highest honors, and adopted measures, to prevent the controversy from being rekindled.(17) It therefore slept in silence for seve-

(14) [This *Typus* is in *Harduin's Concilia*, Tom. iii. p. 823 &c. *Schl.*]

(15) [This council was held in the church of St. John of the Lateran, and thence called the *Lateran Council*. The Acts of it are in *Harduin's Collection*, Tom. iii. p. 626—946. The year before, pope *Theodore* had held a council at Rome, in which he condemned *Pyrrhus*, who had lost the patriarchate of Constantinople, in consequence of his taking part in the civil commotions of that city at the election of a new emperor, together with his successor *Paul*; and had mingled some of the sacramental wine with the ink, with which he signed their condemnation. See *Walch's Historie der Kirchenversamml.* p. 419. The emperor *Constans* hoped, by means of his *Typus*, to put an end to all these commotions; and he would undoubtedly have succeeded, if he had had only candid and reasonable men to deal with. But at Rome a determined spirit of self-justification prevailed; and unfortunately, pope *Martin* was a man who sought to gain a reputation for learning, by metaphysical wrangling. He condemned, in this council, the opinions of an Arabian bishop, *Theodorus* of Pharan, a zealous Monophysite; but touched so lightly on the doctrines of *Honorius*, as not even to mention his name. *Schl.*]

(16) [Pope *Martin*, to give the proceeding a less exceptionable aspect, was accused of various crimes. He was charged with being a partizan of the rebel exarch *Olympius*, with sending supplies of money to the Saracens, &c. From Naxia, he was brought to Constantinople, and there subjected to a judicial trial. He would certainly have lost his head, as a traitor, had not the dying patriarch *Paul*, moved the emperor to commute his punishment into banishment to Cherson; where he soon after died, in great distress. See his 14th and following Epistles; in *Labbe, Concilia*, Tom. vi. and *Concilia regia*, Tom. xv. also *Muratori, History of Italy*, vol. iv. p. 125 &c. *Schl.*—Also *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, vol. iii. *Tr.*]

(17) [*Vitalianus*, as soon as he was elected, dispatched his envoys to Constantinople, and by them sent the customary confession of his faith to the patriarch. The discreet procedure of the pope and the political circumstances of the times, caused his envoys to be well received, and to be sent back to Rome by *Constantine* with splendid presents. The patriarch of Constantinople, also, in his letter of reply, expressed warm desires for union and harmony. When the emperor *Constans*, in the year 663, came to Rome, in his campaign against the Lom-

ral years. But as it was only a concealed fire that burned in secret, and as new commotions hazardous to the public peace were constantly to be feared, *Constantine Pogonatus*, the son of *Constans*, having advised with the Roman pontiff *Agatho*, summoned a *general council*, in the year 680, which is called the *sixth* of the oecumenical councils; and here he permitted the Monothelites, and the Roman pontiff *Honorius*, to be condemned, in the presence of *Agatho's* legates; and he confirmed the decrees of the council, with the sanction of penal laws.(18)

§ 9. It is very difficult to define the real sentiments of the Monothelites, or what it was their adversaries condemned. For neither party is uniform in its statements, and both disclaim the errors objected to them. I. The Monothelites disclaimed all connexion with the *Eutychians* and the *Monophysites*; and confessed that there were, in Christ the Savior, *two natures*, so united, without mixture or confusion, as to constitute but *one person*. II. They admitted that the human soul of Christ was endowed with a will, or the faculty of willing and choosing; and that it did not lose this power of willing and choosing, in consequence of its union with the divine nature. For they held and taught, that Christ was *perfect man*, as well as *perfect God*; and of course, that his human soul had the power of willing and

bards, the pope shewed him more honor, than it became his papal character to shew to one who had murdered his own brother; for the emperor, a few years before, had put his own brother, the deacon *Theodosius*, to death. The pope with all his clergy went out to meet him, two miles from Rome, and escorted him into the city. But all the honors he shewed to the emperor, did not prevent him from carrying off to Constantinople, all the brass which ornamented the city, and even the plates which covered the roof of the Pantheon. See *Anastasius*, de Vita Vitaliani; and *Paulus Diaconus*, Historia Longobardor. Lib. v. c. 6, 7. *Schl.*]

(18) [This council was called by the emperor, who presided in it in person. The number of bishops was small, at first, but increased to near 200. There were eighteen sessions, from the 7th Nov. 680, to the 16th Sept. 681. No one of the ancient councils was conducted with more decorum and fairness. Yet, not the bible, but the decrees of former councils, and the writings of the fathers, were the authority relied upon. All the great patriarchs were present, either personally, or by their representatives. At first the two parties were nearly balanced. But in the 8th session, March 7th, *George*, the patriarch of Constantinople, went over to the side of the orthodox; and was followed by all the clergy of his diocese. *Macarius*, the patriarch of Antioch, who stood firm at the head of the Monothelites, was now outvoted, condemned, and deprived of his office. The Monothelites, as soon as they were adjudged to be heretics, lost their seats; and therefore the decrees of the council were finally carried by a unanimous vote. *Theodorus* of Pharan, *Cyrus* of Alexandria, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus* and *Paul* of Constantinople, *Honorius* of Rome, *Macarius* of Antioch, and some others, were condemned as heretics; and the doctrine of *two wills*, a human and divine, and two *kinds of voluntary acts* in Christ, defined and established. The Acts of this council, Gr. and Lat. are in *Harduin's Concillia*, Tom. iii. p. 1043—1644. and they are not falsified, as some Catholics formerly asserted. See *Combesis*, Diss. apologet. pro Actis vi. Synodi, in his Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr. nov. Tom. ii. p. 65 *Jo. Forbes*, Instructio hist. Theol. L. v. c. 10 *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. Tom. vi. p. 61. *Care*, Hist. Lit. Tom. i. p. 605. *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, (*Agatho*), vol. iii. Tr.]

choosing. III. They denied this power of willing and choosing in the human soul of Christ, to be inactive, or inoperative: on the contrary, they conceded that it operated together with the divine will. IV. They therefore, in reality, admitted *two wills* in Christ, and that both were active and operative wills.(19) Yet V. they maintained, that in a certain sense, there was but *one will* and *one operation* of will in Christ.

§ 10. But these positions were not explained in precisely the same manner, by all who were called *Monothelites*. Some of them, as may be fully proved, intended no more than, that the two wills in Christ, the human and the divine, were always *harmonious*, and in this sense *one*; or that the human will always accorded with the divine will, and was therefore always holy, upright, and good. And in this opinion, there is nothing censurable.(20) But others, approaching nearer to the *Monophysites*, supposed that the two wills in Christ, that is, the two powers of willing, in consequence of the *personal union* (as it is called) of the two natures, were amalgamated and became *one will*: yet they still admitted, that the two wills could be, and should be, discriminated in our conceptions. The greatest part of the sect, and those possessing the greatest acumen, supposed that the will of Christ's human soul was the *instrument* of his divine will: yet when moved and prompted to act, it operated and put forth volitions in connexion with the divine will.(21) From this supposition, the position so obstinately maintained by the *Monothelites*, was unavoidable, that in Christ there was but *one will* and *one operation of will*. For the operation of an instrument, and of him who uses it, is not twofold, but one. Setting aside therefore, the suspicion of *Eutychianism*, and other things connected with that question, the point in controversy was, *whether the human will of Christ sometimes acted from its own impulse, or whether it was always moved by the instigation of the divine nature*.—This controversy is a striking illustration of the fallacious and hazardous nature of every religious peace, which is

(19) [They admitted two *faculties* or voluntary *powers*, a human and a divine; but maintained, that when brought into action, they operated as if they were but *one*. By the expression *one will*, therefore, they seem to have intended *one volition*, or act of the will, and by *one operation*, they intended, *one mode of acting*. See Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ix. p. 584 &c. Tr.]

(20) [See Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ix. p. 592 &c. where he names (in Anm. 1. p. 593.) *Sergius*, *Honorius*, and the *Ecthesis*, as giving these views. Tr.]

(21) [According to Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ix. p. 594 &c. the subordination of the *human* will to the *divine* in Christ, was explained by some, to be altogether *voluntary*, or a consequence of the pious resignation and the faith of the man Christ Jesus: but others supposed, that it resulted from the *nature of the union*, by which the *human nature* became the *instrument* by which the *divine nature* worked; and they illustrated the subject by the subjection of man's bodily members to the empire of his mind or soul. Tr.]

made to rest on ambiguous phraseology. The friends of the council of Chalcedon endeavored to ensnare the *Monophysites*, by means of a proposition of dubious interpretation; and they thus imprudently involved the church and the state in long protracted controversies.

§ 11. The doctrine of the *Monothelites*, condemned and exploded by the council of Constantinople, found a place of refuge among the *Mardaites*, a people who inhabited the mountains of *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, and who about the conclusion of this century, received the name of *Maronites*, from *Jo. Maro* their first bishop, a name which they still retain. No one of the ancients, indeed, has mentioned this man, as the person who brought the Libaniots to embrace monothelism; but there are strong reasons for believing, that it was this *John*, whose surname of *Maro* passed over to the people of whom he was bishop.(22) This however, is demonstrable, from the testimony of *William* of Tyre, and of other unexceptionable witnesses,(23) that the *Maronites* were, for a long time *Monothelites* in sentiment; and that it was not till the twelfth century, when they became reconciled with the Romish church, in the year 1182, that they abandoned the error of *one will* in Christ. The most learned of the modern *Maronites* have very studiously endeavored to wipe off this reproach from their nation; and have advanced many arguments to prove, that their ancestors were always obedient to the see of Rome, and never embraced the sentiments either of the *Monophysites*, or of the *Monothelites*. But they cannot persuade the learned to believe so; for these maintain, that their testimonies are fictitious and of no validity.(24)

(22) The surname of *Maro* was given to this monk, because he had lived in the celebrated monastery of *St. Maro*, on the river Orontes, before he took residence among the *Mardaites* on mount Lebanon. A particular account is given of him, by *Jo. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic. Tom. i. p. 496.* [*Gabriel Sionita*, de Urbibus et moribus Oriental. cap. 8, derives the name of *Maronites*, from an abbot *Maron*, whom he extols for his holiness and his virtues; but he will acknowledge no heretical *Maro*. *Schl.*]

(23) [The passage of *William* of Tyre, is in his *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestar. Lib. xxxii. c. 8.* and is this. "A Syrian nation, in the province of Phenicia, inhabiting the cliffs of Lebanon near the city Biblos, while enjoying temporal peace, experienced a great change in its state. For, having followed the errors of one *Maro*, a *heresiarch*, for nearly 500 years, and so as to be called after him *Maronites*, and to be separated from the church of the faithful, and maintain a separate worship; through divine influence, returning now to a sound mind, they put on resolution and joined themselves to *Aimericus*, the patriarch of Antioch."—The Alexandrian patriarch *Eutychius*, whose *Annals* *Pocock* has translated from the Arabic, likewise mentions a monk *Marun*, "who asserted, that Christ our Lord had *two natures*, and *one will*, one operation and person, and corrupted the faith of men; and whose followers, holding the same sentiments with him, were called *Maronites*, deriving their name from his name *Maro*." *Schl.*]

(24) The cause of the *Maronites* has been pleaded, by *Abrah. Echelensis*, *Gabriel Sionita*, and others of the Maronite nation; but by none of them more fully, than by *Faustus Nairon*, both in his *Dissert. de origine, nomine et religione*

§ 12. Neither the sixth [general] council, which condemned the *Monothelites*, nor the fifth, which had been held in the preceding century, enacted any canons concerning discipline and rites. Therefore a new assembly of bishops was held, by order of *Justinian II*, in the year 692, at Constantinople, in a tower of the palace, which was called *Trullus*. This council, from the place of meeting, was called *Concillium Trullanum*; and from another circumstance, *Quinisextum*, because the Greeks considered its decrees as necessary to the perfection of the Acts of the fifth and sixth councils. We have one hundred and two canons, sanctioned by this assembly, on various subjects pertaining to the external part of worship, the government of the church, and the conduct of christians. But, six of these canons are opposed to the Romish opinions and customs; and therefore the Roman pontiffs refused to approve the council as a whole, or to rank it among the *general* councils, although they have deemed the greatest part of its canons to be excellent.(25)

Maronitarum, Rome 1679. 8vo. and in his *Euoplia fidei Catholicae ex Syrorum et Chaldaeorum monumentis*, Rome 1694. 8vo. Yet *Nairon* induced none to believe his positions, except *Ant. Pagi*, (in his *Critica Baroniana*, ad ann. 694.) and *P. de la Roque*; in whose *Voyage de Syrie et de Montliban*, Tome ii. p. 28—128, there is a long Dissertation concerning the origin of the Maronites. Even *Asseman* who, being a Maronite, spared no pains to vindicate the character of his nation, (*Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. Tom i. p. 496.*) yet does not deny, that much of what has been written by *Nairon* and others, in behalf of the Maronites, is without weight or authority. See *Jo. Morin*, de *Ordinat. sacris*, p. 380 &c. *Rich. Simon*, *Histoire Critique des Chretiens Orientaux*, cap. xiii. p. 146. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 149. and *Praefat. ad Liturgias Orientales.* *Peter le Brun*, *Explication de la Messe*, Tom. ii. p. 626 &c. Paris 1726, 8vo. The arguments on both sides are stated, and the reader is left to form his own judgment, by *Mich. le Quien*; *Christianus Oriens*, Tom. iii. p. 10 &c. [See also *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ix. p. 474—488. *Tr.*]

(25) See *Franc. Pagi*, *Breviarium Pontiff. Roman.* Tom. i. p. 486. *Chr. Lupus*, *Diss. de Concilio Trullano*; in his *Notes and Dissertations on Councils*, Opp. Tom. iii. p. 168 &c. The Romans reject the 5th canon, which approves of the eighty five Apostolic Canons, commonly attributed to *Clement*:—the 13th canon, which allows priests to live in wedlock:—the 55th canon, which condemns fasting on Saturdays, a custom allowed of in the Latin church:—the 67th canon, which earnestly enjoins abstinence from blood and from things strangled:—the 82d canon, which prohibits the painting of *Christ* in the image of a lamb:—and the 86th canon, concerning the equality of the bishops of Rome and Constantinople. [The eastern patriarchs, of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Justiniana, with more than 200 bishops, attended this council. The Roman pontiff had no proper legate there. Yet his ordinary representatives at the imperial court, sat in the council, and subscribed its decisions; and *Basil*, the archbishop of Crete, says in his subscription, that he represented the patriarch of Rome, and all the bishops under him. The emperor attended the council in person, and subscribed its decrees. In the original, a space was left for the subscription of the Roman pontiff: but when it was sent to Rome, by the emperor, and pope *Sergius* was called on to subscribe, he showed such a refractory spirit, as nearly cost him his liberty. The reason was, he found the above mentioned canons to be contrary to the principles and usages of his church. For the same reason, the admirers of the Romish bishop, to this day, are not agreed, whether the whole council, or only the canons which have the misfortune to displease them, should be rejected; notwithstanding, at an early period, pope *Adrian* approved of it. On the other hand, this council was recognized by the Greeks, as a valid one, and classed among the general councils. See *Dr. Walch's Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 441. *Schl.*]

INDEX

TO THE FIRST VOLUME.

- Abasgi*, converted in 6th century 449.
Abbots, their origin and office 320. 389, n (18).
Abdas, bp of Suza, 5th century 377.
Abelites, sect, in 2d cent. 180, n (22).
Abgarus, king of Edessa, 1st cent. 51.
Abraxas, a term used by Basilides 175.
Abyssinians, or Ethiopians, converted, 4th cent. 272.
Acacius, bp of Cesarea, 4th cent. 298, n. 357, n (44).
 — bp of Berea, 5th cent. 395, n.
 — bp in Armenia, 5th cent. 395, n.
 — bp. Cpl. 5th cent. 384. 396, n. 436.
Academics, their doctrines 34, n (34). 78.
Academies, in Rom. emp. 2d cent. 134.
Acephali, sect in 5th cent. 437. 486. 493.
Acolythi, an order of clergy 202.
Acoemetæ, ἀκομήται, 5th cent. 416, n (2).
Acta Martyrum, what 66.
Adamites, sect in 2d cent. 180.
Adamnanus, Irish monk, 6th cent. 522, n.
Aedesius, a philosopher in 4th cent. 278.
Adrian, emp. in 2d cent. 109. 118. 119. 128. 130.
 — a writer in 5th cent. 402.
Aelia Capitolina, Jerusalem 128.
Aelian, procon. of Africa, 4th cent. 338.
Aeneas Gazeus, 5th cent. 397, n.
Aeon, Ἄϊων, what, among Gnostics 76, n (8). 176. 178.
Aerius, a Semi-Arian, 4th cent. 326.
Actius, Arian, 4th cent. 299, n. 358, n (48).
Agapetus, dea. at Cpl. 6th cent. 469, n (23). 483.
 — bp of Rome, 6th cent. 479.
Agathias, historian, 6th cent. 454, n (3).
Agatho, bp of Rome, 7th cent. 522. 536.
Agnoëtae, sect, in 6th cent. 497, n (20).
Agrippa Castor, writer in 2d cent. 150.
Aidan, bp in England, 7th cent. 501, n.
Alans, converted in 6th cent. 449.
Aldhelm, Eng. bp 7th cent. 519, n (26). 525.
Alexander, bp of Jerusalem, 3d cent. 213.
 — *Severus*, emp. 3d cent. 187. 196.
 — bp of Alexand. 4th cent. 298. 342. &c. his epistle 343, n (16).
 — bp of Hierap. 5th cent. 395.
 — of Lycopolis, a philos. 4th cent. 455, n (5).
Alexandria, patriarchate of 283, n (2).
Ambrose, bp of Milan, 4th cent. 301. 316. 317.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 4th cent. 271, n (50).
Ammonius, Sacas, a philos. 2d cent. 136 &c. n (11). 194. 197.
 — a christ. writer, 3d cent. 213. 222.
Amphilochius, of Iconium, 4th cent. 296.
Amru, Saracen conqueror of Egypt 531.
Anastasia, a martyr, in 4th cent. 308.
Anastasius, a presby. of Cpl. 5th cent. 424.
 — *Sinaita*; three of this name 470, n (28). 482.
 — emperor, 6th cent. 493.
 — Apocrisiarius, 7th cent. 521.
 — Monophys. patr. of Antioch 532.
Anatolius, bp of Laodicea, 3d cent. 214.
Andreas, bp of Samosata, 5th cent. 396.
 — bp in Cappadocia, 5th cent. 397, n.
 — bp of Crete, 7th cent. 517, n (19).
Andrew, the apostle 57, n.
Anchorites, or *Anachorites* 320, n (31).
Anglo-Saxons, converted, 6th cent. 450, n (6). and 7th cent. 500 &c. n (5).
Anomoeans, sect, in the 4th cent. 358.
Antidico-Marianites, sect, 4th cent. 369.
Antioch, patriarchate of 283.
Antiochus, monk of Saba, 7th cent. 517, n (17). 524.
Antonines, their character 119.
Antoninus, Marcus, emp. 131. 134. 135.
 — Pius, emp. 2d cent. 120. 130.
Antony, monk, Egypt, 4th cent. 298. 318.
Aphonius, writer, in the 7th cent. 522.
Apocrypha of the N. Test. 88, n (23).
Apollinaris, bp of Hierap. 2d cent. 150.
 — of Antioch, senior and junior, 4th cent. 297, n (29). 316. 359, n (52).
Apollinarian heresy, 4th cent. 359 &c. n. (52).
Apollonius, Tyaneus, 1st cent. 195, n (16).
 — a Gr. writer, 2d cent. 151.
Apologies of christians 124. 130. 131. 154.
 — of Justin Martyr 145 &c. n (4).
Apostles, 50, n (4). 53—56. 87.
Apostles' Creed 96, n (2).
Apostolic Canons and Constitutions 90 224, n.

— Fathers 91—93.

Arabians, converted, in 2d cent. 120.
 121: in 3d cent. 169. 244: in 5th, 372
Arabianus, writer of 2d cent. 154.
Arator, a poet of 6th cent. 475, n (37).
Archbishops 143. 200. 281. 283, n.
Achdeacons, *Archpresbyters*, origin of
 287.
Archelaus, son of Herod 38.
 — bp of Carrha, 3d cent. 214. 235, n.
Arethas, abp in Cappad. 6th cent. 472, n.
Arians, origin of, in 4th cent. 342 &c.
 Sects of, 357 &c.—retire among the
 Goths, in 5th cent. 421 &c. State of,
 in 6th cent. 492. 456: in 7th cent. 530.
Arius 342 &c. 357, n (46). his letter
 344, n (16). his death 353, n (31).
Aristides, apologist, 2d cent. 130. 150.
Aristotelian philosophy 35. in 2d cent.
 135: in 3d cent. 197: in 4th, 277: in
 5th, 380. 382: in 6th, 460: in 7th,
 512.
Aristotle, his opinion of God and the
 soul 35.
Armagh, see of, erected in 5th cent. 374.
Armenians, converted in 4th cent. 272.
Arnobius, senior, 3d cent. 212, n (17).
 222.
 — junior, 5th cent. 400, n (45).
Artemon, heretic, 2d cent. 182.
Arts, the vii Liberal, what 380.
Ascetics, 157. 218. 320, n (29).
Ascunage, John, 7th cent. tritheist 497,
 n (21)
Asterius, of Cappad. 4th cent. 298.
 — of Pontus, in 5th cent. 394.
Asylum, right of, in churches, 7th cent.
 529, n (4).
Athanaric, Gothic k. 4th cent. persec-
 cutor 275.
Athanasius, bp of Alexand. 4th cent.
 289, n (14). 315. 316. 319, n (26). 353.
 — junior, or Celestes, 5th cent. 397, n.
 — bp of Antioch, 7th cent. 532.
Athanasian Creed, spurious 290. n.
Athenagoras, apologist, 2d cent. 131. 136.
 146, n (6).
Atticus, bp of Cpl. 5th cent. 394.
Audaus, 4th cent. reformer 367, n (67).
Audentius, writer, of 4th cent. 316.
Audoenus, or Dado, abp of Rouen, 7th
 cent. 521.
Augustine, bp of Hippo, 4th cent. 303,
 n (35). 314. 316. 341. 376. 420. 421,
 n (9). 442. 443. 444.
 — monk, apostle of Britain, 5th cent.
 450, n (6). 500, n (5).
Augustulus, emp. 5th cent. 370.
Augustus, emp. 1st cent. 25. 78.
Aritus, bp of Clermont, 5th cent. 403,
 n. 452, n (11).
Aurelian, emp. 3d cent. 194.
Aurelius, bp of Carthage, 4th cent. 310.

Ausonius, a poet, 4th cent. 277, n (1).
Autharis, k. of Lombards, 6th cent. 456.
Ἀυτοκέφαλος, independent bp 282, n.
 385, n (9).
Auxumitae, Ethiopians, converted 272.
Babacus, Nestor. abp of Seleucia, 5th
 cent. 431, n.
Baptism, in 1st cent. 102. 105: in 2d,
 167, n (17): in 3d, 230: in 4th, 335:
 in 6th, 489.
Baptism of heretics, 226. 247.
Baptismal fonts, in 4th cent. 335.
Baradaeus, Jacobus, 6th cent. 494 &c.
 n. (12).
Bar-Cochebas, Jew. impostor, 2d cent.
 130.
Bardesanes, heretic, 2d cent. 151. 173.
 174.
Barnabas, St. 1st cent. 57, n.
Barsabas, 1st cent. 54.
Barsanuphius, of Gaza, 6th cent. 472, n.
Barsumas, bp Nisibis, 5th cent. 430 &c.
 — Eutych. monk, 5th cent. 435.
Bartholomew, St. preached in Arabia 57,
 n. 121.
Basil, the Gr. of Cappad. 4th cent. 289,
 n (15).
 — of Ancyra, 4th cent. 299. 358, n
 (47).
 — of Cilicia, 5th cent. 397, n.
 — of Seleucia, 5th cent. 393, n (28).
 409.
 — of Thessalonica, 7th cent. 519, n.
Basilides, 2d cent. his heresy 175. 176.
Believers and Catechumens 82.
Bellator, writer, in 6th cent. 482, n (7).
 484.
Benedict, St. of Nursia, 6th cent. 465, n
 (15). 474.
 — bp of Rome, 7th cent. 522.
Benedictine monks 465 &c. Their rule
 466, n.
Beryllus, of Bostra, 3d cent. 242 &c.
Bishops, origin and history of, in 1st
 cent. 82. 83. 85 &c: in 2d cent. 142
 &c. 162: in 3d, 200 &c: in 4th, 281,
 287: in 5th, 383. 387: in 6th, 463:
 in 7th, 511, 515.
 — in Great Britain 385, n (9). 502, n
 (5).
Bobio, monastery, established, 6th cent.
 465, n (14).
Bobolenus, monk and writer, 7th cent.
 522.
Boethius, a christ. philos. 6th cent. 459.
 477, n (45).
Boniface, I. bp. of Rome, 5th cent. 401, n.
 — II. — 6th cent. 479.
 — III. — 7th cent. 513.
 — IV. — 7th cent. 520, n.
 — V. — 7th cent. 520, n. 528
Bonosus, heretic, 4th cent. 369, n (69).

- Braulio*, bp of Saragossa, 7th cent. 521.
Britons, state of, in the two first centuries 78. 121. 122, n (8) : in 3d cent. 190 : in 5th, 376. 377 : in 6th, 450 &c. 456 : in 7th, 500, n (5). 514.
Bulgaranus, count, 7th cent. 520, n (30).
Burgundians, converted, 5th cent. 356, n (41). 372. 373.
- Caecilian*, bp Carthage, 4th cent. 337 &c.
Caelestine, bp of Rome, 5th cent. 374. 402. 446, n.
Caelestius, the Pelagian, 5th cent. 439 &c. n (46).
Caesarius, of Cpl. 4th cent. 300.
 — of Arles, 6th cent. 447, n. 473, n (30). 483. 512.
Cajanus, *Gajanus*, or *Gainus*, bp of Alexandria, in 6th cent. 496, n (16).
Cainites, sect, in 2d cent. 180.
Caius, presb. Rome, 3d cent. 212, n (18).
Calumnies, against the christians 64. 125. 130. 131. 133. 253.
Candidus, Arian writer, 4th cent. 309.
 — historian, 5th cent. 397, n.
Canon of the N. Test. when settled 87.
 — of the mass, what 489.
Canons of the Apostles : see *Apostolic Canons*.
 — of Nice 286, n (7). 349, n (26).
 — of Sardica 285, n (9).
 — of Chalcedon 383.
Capreolus, bp of Carthage, 5th cent. 402.
Caracalla, emperor 3d cent. 186.
Carpocrates, a Gnostic, 2d cent. 177.
Cassianus, John, 5th cent. 397. 398, n (34). 445, n (54).
Cassiodorus, Senator, 6th cent. 478, n (46). 482.
Castor, Agrippa, 2d cent. 150.
Catechumens, 82. 97. 335.
Catenae Patrum, what 482.
Cathari, in 3d cent. 247.
Celibacy of clergy, in 3d cent. 203.—in 4th 311. 351.
Celsus, opposed christianity, 3d cent. 133. 223.
Celts, their state in 1st cent. 78.
Cent. I. external Hist. 25. internal, 71.
 — II. ——— 119. ——— 134.
 — III. ——— 186. ——— 197.
 — IV. ——— 251. ——— 277.
 — V. ——— 370. ——— 379.
 — VI. ——— 449. ——— 457.
 — VII. ——— 499. ——— 511.
Ceolfred, English monk, 7th cent. 522.
Cerdo, heretic, 2d cent. 172.
Ceremonies and Rites, history of, in 1st cent. 102 &c. : in 2d cent. 161 &c. : in 3d, 229 &c. : in 4th, 331 &c. : in 5th, 416 &c. : in 6th, 489 &c. : in 7th, 528 &c.
Cerinthus, heretic, 1st cent. 116. 117.
Chains, *Catenae Patrum*, 482.
- Chalcedon*, council of, 5th cent. 414. 434.
Chalcidius, philos. in 5th cent. 271, n (51). 455, n. (4).
Chaldaic Christians, Nestorians. 431, n.
Chapters, the three, what 486 &c. n (14).
Chiliasts, Millennarians 225 &c. n (19).
China, enlightened by Nestorians, 7th cent. 499.
Chorepiscopi. 86. 281.
Chosroes, k. of Persia, 6th cent. 456.
Christ, the history of 48 &c. : Revered by pagans 51. 57 : Compared with philosophers 195. 270. 271 : Disputes respecting his body, in 6th cent. 491.
Christian era 48, n (1).—Called the Dionysian era 475 n (34).
Christianity, its nature 95.—Causes of its rapid progress, in 1st cent. 58.—in 2d, 124.—in 3d, 188.—in 4th, 264, 272, 274 —in 5th, 373. 375.—in 6th, 452. 453.
 — History of its progress, in 1st cent. 53, 55, n (9) : in 2d, 120 &c. : in 3d. 188 &c. : in 4th, 272 &c. : in 5th, 371 &c. : in 6th, 449 &c. : in 7th, 499 &c.
Christians, character of, in 1st cent. 54. 58 : in 2d cent. 156 &c. : in 3d, 218 : in 4th, 311 &c. 322 : in 5th, 413 : in 6th, 483 : in 7th, 523. 525.
Chromatius, bp of Aquileia, 5th cent. 401, n.
Chronicon Alexandrinum 518, n.
Chrysostom, John, of Cpl. 292, n (17). 316. 414.
Church, its organization and government, in 1st cent. 54 &c. 86, n (6) : in 2d, 142 &c. : in 3d, 200 &c. : in 4th, 280 &c. : in 5th, 383 &c. : in 6th, 461 &c. : in 7th, 513 &c.
Churches, (buildings,) history of 104. 164. 229. 331. 417. 529.
Cimbrians, heard the gospel, in 7th cent. 504.
Circumcelliones, sect of, 4th cent. 339 &c. 419 &c.
Claudius, emp. 3d cent. 194.
Clemens Romanus, 1st cent. 89—91.
 — Alexandr. 2d cent. 136. 148, n (8). 153. 155.
Clementina, spurious 90. 224, n (16).
Clergy, character and state of, in 1st cent. 82 &c. : in 2d, 144 : in 3d, 202 &c. : in 4th, 279. 287 : in 5th, 387 &c. : in 6th, 463, n (10) : in 7th, 515, n (9).
Clovis, k. of Salii, converted, 5th cent. 373.
Coenobites, what 320.
Cogitosus, an Irish monk, 6th cent. 479.
Collyridians, sect, in 4th cent. 369, n.
Columbas, monk of Hii, 6th cent. 451, n (7).
Columbanus, Irish monk and missiona-

- ry, in 6th cent. 465, n (14). 477. 502. 514, n (7).
- Commentators*, the principal, in 2d cent. 153: in 3d cent. 219 &c.: in 4th, 313 &c.: in 5th, 407 &c.: in 6th, 481 &c.: in 7th, 524.
- Commodianus*, a poet. 3d cent. 214.
- Commodus*, emp. 2d cent. 132.
- Community of goods*, in prim. church 55. 84.
- Concubinage of the clergy*, in 3d cent. 203, n (8).
- Confessions*, private to priests, 5th cent. 417, n (5).
- Confessors*, who 64.
- Congal*, Irish monk, 6th cent. 465, n (13).
- Conon*, of Tarsus, his sect, 6th cent. 497. 498.
- Consociation of churches* 86: in 2d cent. 142, n (2): in 3d cent. 200.
- Constant I.* emp. 4th cent. 263. 264.
- II. emp. 7th cent. 535.
- Constantine I.* or the Great 255: Gives liberty to christians 256, n. (16). 257, n (19): His conversion 257 &c: Abolishes paganism 258: Sees a luminous cross 258. 260; n: His regulations for the church 263, n (34). 281. 283. 284. 333. 338: His writings 298: His letter to Arius and Alexander 345 &c. n (21).
- Constantine II.* emp. 4th cent. 263. 264.
- IV. Pogonatus, 7th cent. 514. 536.
- Constantinople*, patriarchate of, 283, n (2). 286: The patriarch's contests with Rom. Pontiff in 4th cent. 286: in 5th cent. 383. 386: in 6th, 461 &c.: in 7th, 513.
- Constantinopolitan councils*, general AD. 381. p. 363 &c.: AD. 553. p. 485. 487: AD. 680. p. 536: AD. 692 or in Trullo p. 539.
- Constantius*, Chlorus 251. 254, n (10). 255.
- I. emp. 4th cent. 263. 264. 354.
- Constitutions of Apostles*: see *Apostolic Canons*.
- Controversies*, among christians; in 1st cent. 100 &c.: in 2d cent. 154: in 3d, 225 &c.: in 4th, 322 &c.: in 5th, 413 &c.: in 6th, 484 &c.: in 7th 526.
- Copiatæ*, what their office 203.
- Cornelius*, bp of Rome, 3d cent. 213. 245, n (20).
- Corrupticolæ*, sect, in 6th cent 496.
- Cosmas*, Indicopleustes, 6th cent. 460, n (15).
- Councils*, none in 1st cent. 86, n (17): Originated in the 2d cent. 86. 143: At first provincial 142, n (2).
- Concils*, general, or oecumenical 280.
- The first, AD. 325, at Nice, 347—351.
- The second, AD. 381, at Constantinople; 363 &c.
- The third, AD. 431, at Ephesus 426, n (19).
- The fourth, AD. 451, at Chalcedon 434, n (31).
- The fifth, AD. 553, at Constantinople 487.
- The sixth, AD. 680, at Constantinople 536, n (18).
- The seventh, AD. 691, in Trullo 539, n (25).
- Creaticolæ*, a sect, in 6th cent. 496.
- Creed*, Apostles 96, n (2).
- Creed*, Nicene 347, n (22).
- Crescens*, opposed christian. 2d cent. 133.
- Cresconius*, bp in Africa, 7th cent. 520, n. (28).
- Cyclus Paschalis*, of Dionys. Exiguus 475, n (34).
- Cummianus*, Irish monk, 7th cent. 521.
- Cummeneus* Albus, Irish monk, 7th cent. 521.
- Cyprian*, bp of Carthage, 3d cent. 210, n (15). 193. 194. 200 n (1). 201, n (3). 202, n. (4). 222. 223. 227. 246, n. — Gallic monk, 6th cent. 479.
- Cyril*, bp of Jerusalem, 4th cent. 291, n (16). 314.
- bp of Alexand. 5th cent. 390 n (21). 316. 407. 424 &c.
- monk of Palestine, 6th cent. 472, n. 484.
- Cyrus*, bp of Alexand. 7th cent. 518, n. 532.
- Dado*, or Audoenus, of Rouen, 7th cent. 521.
- Damascius*, a philos. 5th cent. 455, n (6).
- Damasus*, I. bp of Rome, 4th cent. 306, n (40). 284.
- Damianists*, sect, 6th cent. 498.
- Deaconesses*, their office 84.
- Deacons*, in 1st cent. 54. 81. 83: in 2d cent. 142. 144: in 4th cent. 287: in 5th, 387 &c.
- Decius*, emp. 2d cent. persecutor 192.
- Deities*, the pagan 27. 30.
- Demas*, mentioned by Paul 108.
- Demetrius*, bp Alex. 3d cent. 227. 228.
- Demiurge*, of oriental philos. 76. 178.
- Demoniacs*, in 4th cent. 315. 316.
- Desiderius*, bp of Vienne, 6th cent. 458, n (4).
- bp of Cahors, 7th cent. 519, n (23).
- Diadochus*, bp in Illyricum, 5th cent. 396. 410.
- Didymus*, of Alexand. 4th cent. 295, n (25). 316.
- Diocesses*, episcopal, origin of 85. 86.

- Diocletian*, emp. 4th cent. persecutor 252 &c.
Diodorus, or *Theodorus*, bp of Tarsus, 4th cent. 295, n (22). 314. 316.
Dion Cassius, historian, 3d cent. 197.
Dionysius, bp of Corinth, 2d cent. 150.
 — or *Denys*, bp of Paris, 3d cent. 189.
 — the Great, bp of Alexand. 3d cent. 208, n (13). 222. 226. 242, n.
 — bp of Rome, 3d cent. 214.
 — *Areopagita*, 225, n (17). 318, n (23).
 — *Exiguus*, 6th cent. 475, n (84). 484.
Dioscorus, bp of Alex. 5th cent. 433. 434.
Diotrephes, 1st cent. 108.
Disciples, the 70, of Christ 50. 51, n (5). 79. 80.
Divinity: see *Theology*.
Docetae, Gnostic sect, described 173, § 7.
 — sect in 6th cent. 496.
Doctrine, secret, of early christians 98. 99.
 — two-fold, or two-fold rule of life 156. 317. 483.
Domitian, emp. 1st cent. persecut. 62. 69.
Domitilla, Flavia, 1st cent. martyr 70.
Donatists, sect of, its history, in 4th cent. 336—341: in 5th, 419—421: in 6th, 492.
Donatus, a Donatist bp, 4th cent. 308. 337, n (3).
Dorotheus, pseudo 4th cent. 298, n (30).
 — bp of Martianop. 5th cent. 395.
 — abbot, 7th cent. 516, n (16). 525.
Dositheus, heretic, 1st cent. 112, n (7).
Dracontius, poet, 5th cent. 401, n.
Druids, 78. 388, n (14).
Ducenarius, what 243, n (14).
Dynamius, a writer of 6th cent. 480.
- Eadbald*, k. of Kent, 7th cent. 501, n.
East Anglia, converted, 7th cent. 501, n.
East Saxons, converted, 7th cent. 501, n.
Easter, disputes about it, 2d cent. 165 &c. 350. also in the 7th cent. 502, n. 526.
Ebionites, sect, 2d cent. 118. 170.
Eclectic philosophy 36, 135 &c. 271.
Ecthesis, of Heraclius, 7th cent. 534.
Economical method of disputing 223, n (11).
Edwin, k. of Northumberland, 7th cent. 501, n.
Elcesaites, sect, 2d cent. 171.
Eligius, or *Eloi*, bp, 7th cent. 512. 519, n (24). 523, n (2).
Elpidius, Rusticus, of 5th cent. 404.
Elzai, heretic, 2d cent. 171.
- Empire*, Roman, state of, at Christ's birth 25 &c.: Favorable to the propagation of christianity 26: Its civil and ecclesiastical divisions and provinces, in 4th cent. 282, n (2).
Encratites, sect, 2d cent. 174: 4th cent. 336.
England, when first converted 121. 122, n (8).
Ennodius, bp of Pavia, 6th cent. 474, n (32). 462. 464. 484.
Ephesine general council, AD. 431. p. 426, n (19).
 — council of robbers, AD. 449. p. 433. 434.
Ephraim, Syrus, 4th cent. 294, n (20). 316.
 — patr. of Antioch, 6th cent. 471.
Epictetus, Stoic philos. 2d cent. 135.
Epicureans, 33, n (33). 78. 135.
Epiphanius, bp in Cyprus, 4th cent. 293, n (18). 315. 316. 329. 414.
 — bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 471.
 — Scholasticus, eccl. hist. 6th cent. 478, n.
Epiphany, day of, fixed, in 4th cent. 334.
Episcopacy: see *Bishops*.
Eremites, or Hermits, in 3d cent. 218.; in 4th, 320.
Essenes, Jewish sect. 42, 43.
Ethelbert, k. of Kent, 6th cent. 450. 501, n.
Ethiopians, converted, 4th cent. 272. 273.
Evagrius, archdea. Cpl. 4th cent. 300.
 — a Gallic presb. 6th cent. 408, n (13).
 — Scholasticus, eccl. hist. 6th cent. 469, n (27).
Evangelists, who so called, 79. 80.
Eucherius, bp of Lyons, 5th cent. 398, n (36). 410.
Euchites, or Messalians, 4th cent. 368. 369.
Eudocia, emp. and writer, 5th cent. 395.
Eudoxia, empress, who opposed Chrysostom 414.
Eudoxius, bp of Cpl. 4th cent. 299.
Eugenius, abp of Toledo, 7th cent. 521.
Eugyppius, monk of Italy, 6th cent. 478, n. 484.
 — monk of Africa, 6th cent. 480.
Eulogius, presb. of Antioch, 6th cent. 469.
Eunapius, pagan philos. 4th cent. 270.
Eunomius, *Eunomians*, 4th cent. 299. 358, n (50).
Evodius, bp in Africa, 5th cent. 402.
Eusebius Pamphili, bp of Cesarea, 4th century, 287, n (12). 316. 328. 357, n (43).
 — of Nicomedia, Arian, 4th century, 298. 345. 352. 357, n (43).
 — bp of Emessa, 4th cent. 299. 316.

- of Vercelli, 4th cent. 308.
 — of Doryleum, 5th cent. 396. 433.
 — of Thessalonica, 7th cent. 518, n.
Eustathians, sect in 4th cent. 325, n (41).
Eustathius, of Antioch, 4th cent. 295, n (24).
 — of Armenia, 4th cent. 324. 325, n (41).
 — of Sebaste, 4th cent. 327, n (45).
 — of Syria, 5th cent. 397, n.
 — Lat. writer, 5th cent. 402.
Eustratius, of Cpl. 6th cent. 472, n.
Euthalius, dea. in Egypt, 5th cent. 396.
Eutherius, abp of Tyanea, 5th cent. 396.
Eutropius, bp of Valencia, 6th cent. 480.
Eutyches, heretic, 5th cent. 396, n. 432 &c.
Eutychians, sect, 5th cent. 432 &c.
Eutychius, bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 472, n.
Euzoius, Arian, bp of Antioch, 4th cent. 324, n.
Ewald, two English missionaries, 7th cent. 504, n.
Exarchs, ecclesiastical 281.
Excommunication, in 1st and 2d cent. 160.—in 3d, 192. 193.—in 4th, 247.—in 5th, 388, n (14).
Exorcism, before baptism, 3d cent. 231, n (13).
Exorcists, in 3d cent. 202.
Exposition of scriptures: see *Theology*, exegetic.
Exucontians, Arians, 4th cent. 258, n (49).

Facundus, Afr. bp. 6th cent. 475, n (36).
Fastidius, Priscus, Britton, 5th cent. 401, n. 410.
Fasting; in 1st cent. 102.—in 2d, 184.—in 3d, 231.—in 4th, 334.—in 5th, 416.
Fathers, Apostolic 91 &c.
Faustinus, a Luciferian, 4th cent. 309.
Faustus, a Manichaean, 4th cent. 310.
 — bp of Riez, 5th cent. 403. 446, n (55).
 — disciple of St. Benedict 520, n.
Felicitas, a martyr, 3d cent. 191.
Felix, bp of Aptunga, Africa, 4th cent. 337 &c.
 — I. bp of Rome, 5th cent. 403.
 — III. ———— 5th cent. 438.
 — IV. ———— 6th cent. 479.
 — bp of Dunwich, Engl. 7th cent. 501, n.
Festivals; in 1st cent. 103 &c: in 2d, 165.: in 4th, 333. 334.: in 6th, 490: in 7th, 528.
Firmillian, of Capadocia, 3d cent. 213.
Flavia Domitilla, a martyr, 1st cent. 70.
Flavianus, bp of Antioch, 4th cent. 300.
 — bp of Cpl. 5th cent. 396. 433 &c.
Flavius Clemens, a martyr, 1st cent. 70.
Florinians, sect, 2d cent. 180.
Florus, Paul Cyrus, a poet, 6th cent. 472, n.

Fortunatianus, bp of Aquileia, 4th cent. 308.
Fortunatus, bp of Poitiers, 6th cent. 476, n (40).
Fosteland, what 500. 504, n.
Francs in Gaul, converted, 5th cent. 373.
Franconians converted, 7th cent. 503, n (9).
Frauds, pious; in 1st cent. 88: in 2d, 159: in 3d, 224: in 4th, 312. 321: in 5th, 409.
Fredegarius, a French historian, 7th cent. 520, n (29).
Frieslanders, converted, 7th cent. 504.
Fronto assails christians, 2d cent. 133.
Fructuosus, abp of Braga, 7th cent. 521.
Fruventius, converts the Abyssinians, 4th cent. 272.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, Africa, 6th cent. 474, n (31).
 — Ferrandus, 6th cent. 475, n (35).
Fullo, Peter, 5th cent. 435 &c.

Gajanus, or Gainus, or Cajanus, bp of Antioch, in 6th cent. 496, n (16).
Gall, St. 7th cent. his life 502, n (8).
Galerius Maximin, 3d cent. persecutes 252 &c.
Gallienus, emp. 3d cent. 188. 194.
Gallus, emp. 3d cent. persecutes 193.
Gamaliel, Jewish patriarch, 5th cent. 378.
Gaudentius, of Brescia, 4th cent. 310.
Gauls, state of; in 1st cent. 78: converted, in 2d cent. 121—123, n (9): in 3d, 189: in 4th, 274.
Gelasius I. bp of Rome, 5th cent. 403. 409.
 — of Cyzicum, 5th cent. 393, n (30).
Gennadius, of Marseilles, 5th cent. 403. 409.
Genseric, Vandal k. in Africa, Arian, persecutes 422.
George, bp of Laodicea, 4th cent. 299. 358, n (47).
 — monk of Galatia, 7th cent. 518, n.
 — bp of Alexandria, 7th cent. 518, n.
Georgians, converted in 4th cent. 273.
Germanus, (St. Germain,) of Paris, 6th cent. 480.
Germany, state of; in 1st cent. 78: in 2d, 121: in 3d, 189: in 5th, 272. 273: in 6th, 451: in 7th, 502 &c.
Gifts, extraordinary: see *Miracles*.
Gildas, the Wise, Briton of 6th cent. 476, n (42).
Gnostics; in 1st cent. 73. 109 &c: in 2d, 171—181: in 3d, 233: in 4th, 364 &c.
Godfathers, or sponsors, 2d cent. 167.
Gordianus, Bened. monk, 6th cent. 479.
Goths, conversion of 189. 273. 356, n. 372 &c.
Grace contests about; in 5th cent. 440 &c. 445 &c. 447: in 6th cent. 492: in 7th, 530.

- Granianus*, procons. Asia, 2d cent. 130.
Gratian, 3d cent. preached in Gaul 189.
 — emp. 4th cent. 340. 355. 356, n (37).
Greeks and *Latins*, at variance, 7th cent. 513. 526.
Gregentius, abp in Arabia, 6th cent. 472, n. 409.
Gregory, Thaumaturgus, 3d cent. 207, n (12). 222.
 — Illuminator, Armenia, 4th cent. 272.
 — Nazianzen, 4th cent. 293, n (19). 314. 316.
 — Nyssen, 4th cent. 293, n (19).
 — the Great, bp of Rome, 6th cent. 472, n (29). 450. 458, n (4). 461, n. 468, n (18). 481. 482.
 — bp of Tours, 6th cent. 476, n (41).
 — or George, Pisides, 7th cent. 517, n (20).
- Hadrian*: see *Adrian*.
Heathen: see *Pagan*.
Hegesippus, eccles. hist. 2d cent. 150.
Helena, mother of Constantine, 4th cent. 312, n. (1).
Helladius, bp of Tarsus, 5th cent. 395.
Helvetians, converted, in 7th cent. 503, n (8).
Hemerobaptists, Jewish sect 40, n (7).
Henoticon, an edict of Zeno, 5th cent. 436 &c. n (36).
Heracian, of Chalcedon, 6th cent. 492.
Heracides, monk of Cpl. 5th cent. 394.
Heracius, emp. 7th cent. 532. 534.
Heresies; in 1st cent. 108 &c: in 2d, 169 &c: in 3d, 233 &c: in 4th, 336 &c: in 5th, 419 &c: in 6th, 492 &c: in 7th, 530 &c.
Hermas, Shepherd of 93.
Hermes, ancient pagan philos. 159, n (15).
Hermits, or *Eremites*; in 3d cent 218: in 4th, 320.
Hermogenes, of 2d cent. 183.
Hero, Platon. philos. 5th cent. 381, n (12).
Herod, the Great 38, 46.
Heruli, invade Italy, 5th cent. 370.
 — converted, 6th cent. 449.
Hesychius, of Egypt, 3d cent. 215. 219.
 — a moralist, 7th cent. 525.
Hexapla, of Origen 219, n (6).
Hierarchy, its origin 142—144. See more under *Church*, government of.
Hierocles, philos. 4th cent. 270, n (45).
Hieronymus: see *Jerome*.
Hilarion, Syrian monk, 4th cent. 318.
Hilary, bp of Poitiers, 4th cent. 300, n (31). 315.
 — bp of Arles, 5th cent. 402. 446, n.
 — of Rome, Luciferian, 4th cent. 309.
 — bp of Rome, 5th cent. 403.
- Hippolytus*, of 3d cent. 207, n (11). 211. 222. 223.
History, ecclesiastical, what 15: External and internal 15. 16: How to be treated 18 &c: Dangers to be avoided 19: It uses 20.
Honorius, emp. 4th cent. 269. 370. 419 &c.
 — I. bp of Rome, 7th cent. 521: He was not infallible 533, n (10). 536.
Hormisdas, bp of Rome, 6th cent. 478, n. 488.
Hosius, of Corduba, 4th cent. 295, n (23). 258, n (23). 339.
Huneric, Arian k. of Vandals in Africa, 5th cent. persecutes 422.
Huns, in 6th cent. 456.
Hyle, ὕλη, of the Manichaeans 236.
Hypatia, fem. philos. 4th cent. 278, n (5).
Jacobites, or *Monophysites* 494. 495.
Jacobus, Baradaeus, restorer of the Monophysites, in 6th cent. 494 &c. n (12).
Jamblichus, Platon. philos. 4th cent. 277, n (2).
James, son of Zebadee, martyr 57, n (61).
 — the Just, or the less, martyr 57, n (61).
 — bp of Nisibis, 4th cent. 298. 316.
 — bp of Edessa, 5th cent. 396. 486, n (14). 431, n.
Idacius, Clarus, a Sp. bp 4th cent. 310.
Idatius, or *Hydatius*, Span. bp 5th cent. 403.
Jerome, or *Hieronymus*, monk, 4th cent. 300, n.
 — — monk, presbyter and learned father 302, n (34). 313. 328. 329. 413.
Jerusalem, first church there 54: Demolished by the Romans, AD. 70. p. 62: Rebuilt, and called *Aelia Capitolina*, in 2d cent. 128: Captured by the Saracens, 7th cent. 517, n (18): Patriarchate of 283, n (2). 384.
Jesu Jabas, a Nestor. patr. 7th cent. 499. 530.
Jews, civil and religious state, at Christ's birth 38—47: Notices of, in 1st cent. 62: in 2d cent. 128. 130. 169: in 3d, 196: in 4th, 268: in 5th, 372, n. 378: in 6th, 452: in 7th, 505. 506.
Ignatius, bp of Antioch, 2d cent. 91: 92, n (31). 129.
Ildefonsus, of Toledo, 7th cent. 519, n (22). 524.
Independence of prim. churches 86. 142.
Indians, (Arabs,) converted by Pantaeus 120.
Innocent I. bp of Rome, 5th cent. 401, n.
Interpreters of scripture: see *Commentators*.
John, the apostle, martyr under Domitian 57, n. 70.

- the Baptist 49.
 — bp of Jerus. 4th cent. 300. 329. 442.
 — Chrysostom: see *Chrysostom*.
 — bp of Antioch, 5th cent. 395. 425. 426, n (18). (19). 430.
 — *Aegeates*, 5th cent. 396.
 — the Faster, bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 461. 469, n (25).
 — bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 471.
 — *Climacus*, Sinaita, 6th cent. 472, n.
 — *Maro*, 6th cent. 472, n.
 — Philoponus, 6th cent. 497, n (22). 455. 460. 484.
 — Scholasticus, bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 472, n.
 — of Scythopolis, 6th cent. 483.
 — II. bp of Rome, 6th cent. 479. 488.
 — monk of Spain, 6th cent. 480.
 — *Ascunage*, 6th cent. 497, n (21).
 — *Malala*, historian, 7th cent. 518, n.
 — *Moschus*, monk of Palestine, 7th cent. 518, n.
 — abp of Dara, 7th cent. 518, n.
 — abp of Thessalonica, 7th cent. 519, n.
 — IV. bp of Rome, 7th cent. 521. 534.
Jonas, an Irish monk, 7th cent. 521.
 — disciple of Columbanus, 7th cent. 521.
Jornandes, or *Jordanes*, histor. 6th cent. 479.
Jovian, emp. 4th cent. 268, n (43). 355.
Jovinian, Ital. monk and reformer, 4th cent. 327 &c.
Irenaeus, bp of Lyons, 2d cent. 144 &c. n (5). 166.
 — count, and bp of Tyre, 5th cent. 396, n.
Irish nation, converted in 5th cent. 374.
Isaac, a converted Jew, 5th cent. 395.
 — bishop of Ninive, 6th cent. 471.
Isidorus, of Pelusium, 5th cent. 391, n (23). 407.
 — of Corduba, 5th cent. 402. 407.
 — of Seville, 6th cent. 477, n (44). 482. 483. 484.
 — of Gaza, a philos. 278. 459, n (8).
Irychius, or *Hesychius*, bp of Jerusalem, 7th cent. 516, n (15). 524.
Judas, a writer of 3d cent. 213.
Julia Mammæa, 3d cent. 187.
Julian, emp. 4th cent. 264. 265, n (40). 270. 340. 355.
 — a Pelagian bp and writer, 5th cent. 401, n.
 — bp of Halicar. 6th cent. 470, n. 482. 495.
 — abp of Toledo, 7th cent. 514, n (6).
 — *Pomerius*, 5th cent. 404. 411.
 — —, 7th cent. 520, n (27). 524. 526.
Julius, Africanus 3d cent. 205. 206, n (10).
 — I. bp of Rome, 4th cent. 308.
 — *Firmicus Maternus*, poet, 4th cent. 308. 316.
Junilius, bp in Africa, 6th cent. 479. 481.
Justification, contest on, 1st cent. 100.
Justin, Martyr, 2d cent. 144, n (4). 153. 154. 155. 130. 132: His Apologies 145, n. 146, n.
 — bp in Sicily, 5th cent. 397.
Justian I. emp. 6th cent. 479. 484. 486.
Justus, a Spanish bp 6th cent. 479.
 — bp of Rochester, 7th cent. 501, n.
Juvenal, bp of Aelia (Jerus.) 5th cent. 384.
Juvencus, Spanish poet, 4th cent. 306, n (41).
Kabbala, Jewish 45. 77.
Kent, kingd. of converted, 7th cent. 450. 501, n.
Kilian, Irish missionary, 7th cent. 502, n (9).
Koran, of Muhammed 507, n.
Labarum, sacr. standard of Constantine 262, n.
Lactantius, writer, of 4th cent. 301, n (32). 315. 316.
Lapsed christians 192. 193, n (8). 245. 350.
Laura, of monks, what 485, n (13).
Laurentius, a martyr, 3d cent. 194.
 — bp of Rome, 6th cent. 463 &c.
 — bp of Novara, 6th cent. 478, n.
 — bp. of Canterbury, 7th cent. 501, n.
Leander, abp of Seville, 6th cent. 408.
Learning, state of, in 1st cent. 71 &c. 77: in 2d, 134 &c: in 3th, 197 &c: in 4th, 277 &c: in 5th, 379 &c: in 6th, 457 &c: in 7th, 511 &c.
Lectors, or Readers 202.
Legion, thundering, in 2d cent. 127.
Lent, in 4th cent. 334, n (13).
Leo I. the Great, bp of Rome, 5th cent. 397, n (32). 384. 434.
 — II. bp of Rome, 7th cent. 522.
Leonidas, father of Origen, 3d cent. 191.
Leontius, Arian bp of Antioch, 4th cent. 299.
 — of Byzantium, 6th cent. 469, n (26). 484.
 — of Neapolis, Cyprus, 6th cent. 472, n. 483.
Libaniots, converted, 5th cent. 372.
Libanius, sophist, 4th cent. 269. 270, n (48).
Libellatici, what 192, n (6).
Liberatus, of Carthage, 6th cent. 476, n (39).
Liberius, bp of Rome, 4th cent. 308. 354.
Licinianus, bp in Spain, 6th cent. 480.
Licinius, emp. 4th cent. 263.

- Litanies to the saints*, 6th cent. 490, n (3).
Liturgies, 105. 232, n (19). 333. 489, n (1).
Lombards, occupy Italy AD. 568, and become christians AD. 587. p. 456.
Lord's supper: in 1st cent. 54. 102. 105: in 2d, 166: in 3d, 230: in 4th, 335: in 6th, 489.
Love-feasts, ἀγάπαι 54. 167. 417, n (4).
Lucian, of Antioch, 3d cent. 215. 219. 222.
Lucifer, of Cagliari, 4th cent. 309. 325. 326.
Luciferians, sect, 4th cent. 326.
Lucius, k. of England, 2d cent. 121.
Lupus, bp of Troyes, 5th cent. 402.
Lyons and Vienne, persecution in 2d cent. 132.
- Macarius*, senior, and junior, monks of Egypt, 4th cent. 296, n (28). 317.
 — Monothelite patriarch, 7th cent. 519, n. 536, n (18).
Macedonius, and Macedonians, 4th cent. 362—364, n.
Macrobius, Donatist bp 4th cent. 308.
Magians, of Persia 71.
Magus: see *Simon Magus*.
Mahomet: see *Muhammed*.
Majorinus, Donatist bp of Carthage, 4th cent. 337.
Malchion, a rhetorician, 3d cent. 214. 244.
Malchus, a Byzantine historian, 5th cent. 397, n.
Mamertus, Claudius, poet; 5th cent. 403.
Manes, or *Manichæus*, heretic, 3d cent. 234 &c. n (6).
Manichæans, sect of: in 3d cent. 235 &c: in 4th, 336. 419: in 6th, 492: in 7th, 530.
Maphrian, or primate of the Monophysites 495.
Marcella, a martyr, 3d cent. 191.
Marcellinus, Ammianus, histor. 4th cent. 271, n (50).
 — governor of Africa, 5th cent. 420.
 — count, a writer, 6th cent. 479.
 — Eng. missionary, 7th cent. 503. 504, n.
Marcellus, of Ancyra, 4th cent. 208. 360, n (55), (56).
Marcion, and Marcionites: 2d cent. 172. 173. 419.
Marculfus, Gallie monk, 7th cent. 519, n (25).
Marcus, a Gnostic, 2d cent. 179.
 — bp in Egypt, 4th cent. 299, n.
 — a Gnostic in Spain, 4th cent. 364.
 — a hermit, 5th cent. 394. 410.
 — a disciple of St. Benedict, 7th cent. 520, n.
Mardaites 538. See *Maronites*.
Marius, Mercator, 5th cent. 400, n (41).
 — bp in Switzerland, 6th cent. 480.
- Maro*, John, 7th cent. 538.
Maronites, 538.
Martin, bp of Tours, 4th cent. 274, n (64). 319. 365, n.
 — bp of Braga, 6th cent. 480. 483.
 — I. bp of Rome, 7th cent. 521. 535.
Martyrs 55, n (8): Their number and estimation 64. 65.
Mary, St. worshipped, 4th cent. 369.
 Her images, in churches, 5th cent. 417. Called the Mother of God, 5th cent. 494.
Masses, for the saints, 4th cent. 335.
Massilians 445 &c. See *Semi-Pelagians*.
Matthew, the apostle 57, n.
Matthias, the apostle 54.
Maurus, St. a Benedictine monk, 6th cent. 468.
 — abp of Ravenna, 7th cent. 514, n (7).
Maxentius, John, 6th cent. 469, n (22).
Maximilla, a Montanist, 2d cent. 185.
Maximin, emp. 3d cent. persecutes 191.
 — bp in Cilicia, 5th cent. 395.
Maximus, pagan philos. 4th cent. 278, n (4). 279.
 — of Turin, 5th cent. 398, n (35).
 — of Riez, 5th cent. 402.
 — of Cpl. 7th cent. 516, n (14). 524. 525.
Melchιάdes, bp of Rome, 4th cent. 338.
Melchisedeckians, sect, 2d cent. 183, n (27).
Melchites, who so called 495, n (12). 531.
Meletian contest, 4th cent. 322. 323, n. 350.
Meletius, bp of Sebaste, 4th cent. 299, n.
 — bp of Mopauestia, 5th cent. 395.
Melito, bp of Sardis, 2d cent. 150. 154.
Mellitus, first bp of Lond. 7th cent. 501, n.
Menander, heretic, 1st cent. 115.
Mennas, bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 484.
Mercator, Marius, 5th cent. 400. n (41).
Mercia, km of, converted, 7th cent 502, n.
Messalians, or Euchites, 4th cent. 368. 369.
Methodius, 3d cent. 209. 210, n (14). 222.
Metropolitans, origin of 86. 143. 281.
Millennial controversy, 3d cent. 225, n (19).
Miltiades, 2d cent 151.
Ministry, public, necessary 79.
Minucius Felix, 3d cent. 211, n (16). 222.
Miracles: in 1st cent. 53. 59: in 2d, 125. n (14): in 3d, 168: in 4th, 260 &c. 268. 275: in 5th, 373, n (11). 375: in 6th, 452: in 7th, 524.
Monarchians, sect of, 2d cent. 182.
Monkery: in 1st cent. 44, n (14): in 2d, 139. 140: in 3d, 218: in 4th, 318 &c: in 5th, 389 &c: in 6th, 464 &c: in 7th, 515. 516.
Monophysites: in 5th cent. 438 &c: in 6th, 493 &c: in 7th, 530 &c.
Monothelites, rise of, in 7th cent. 532

- &c. Their tenets 536: And history 538. 539.
- Montanus*, a schismatic, 2d cent. 184 &c.
- abp of Toledo, 6th cent. 479.
- Moralists* and morals: see *Theology*, practical.
- Moschus*, John, a monk, 7th cent. 518, n.
- Moses*, a Jewish fanatic of Crete, 4th cent. 372, n (7).
- Muhammed*, the Arabian, 7th cent. 506 &c. His testament 531, n (3).
- Muhammedans*, their conquests 507. 509. Sects of 509.
- Musanus*, a writer of 2d cent. 151.
- Mutianus*, Scholasticus, 6th cent. 479.
- Mysteries*, the pagan 29 &c: Copied by christians 162 &c.
- Mystics*: in 2d cent. 140: in 3d, 217 &c. 224: in 4th, 314. 317: in 5th, 410: in 6th, 483: in 7th, 525.
- Narcissus*, bp of Jerusalem, 3d cent. 213.
- Nations*, state of, at Christ's birth 25 &c.
- Nazareans*, sect in 2d cent. 118. 169 &c.
- Nectarius*, bp of Cpl. 4th cent. 300, n.
- Nemesius*, bp of Emessa, 4th cent. 300, n.
- Nennius*, a British monk, 7th cent. 520, n.
- Nepos*, bp in Egypt, 3d cent. 225. 226.
- Nero*, emp. 1st cent. persecutes 58, n. 62. 66—68.
- Nestorianus*, a chronographer, 5th cent. 396, n.
- Nestorius*, heresiarch, 5th cent. 395, n. 423 &c.
- Nestorianism*, what 428 &c. n (21): History of, in 5th cent. 423 &c: in 6th, 493: in 7th, 530.
- Nicaeas*, of Romacia, 5th cent. 408.
- Nice*, council of, AD. 325. pa. 347—351, n.
- Nicetius*, abp of Treves, 6th cent. 479. 483.
- Nicias*, a writer of 7th cent. 526, n (9).
- Nicolaitans*, sect, in 1st cent. 115.
- Nilus*, of Cpl. a writer, 5th cent. 393, n (27). 410.
- Ninian*, Eng. bp in 5th cent. 451, n (7).
- Noetus*, and Noetians, 3d cent. 240, n (11).
- Nonnosus*, writer of 6th cent. 471.
- Nonnus*, Egyptian poet, 5th cent. 394.
- monk of Palestine, 6th cent. 485, n (13).
- Northumberland*, converted in 7th cent. 501, n.
- Novatian*, or Novatus, 3d cent. 213. 245. His sect 245 &c. 350. 419.
- Odoacer*, k. of the Heruli, conquered Italy, AD. 476. pa. 370.
- Oeconomical* method of disputing 223, n (11).
- Oecumenical*, or general Councils: see Councils.
- Oecumenical*, or universal bp 461, n (1). 513.
- Olympiodorus*, a Platonic philos. 4th cent. 278.
- a historian, 5th cent. 378, n (7). 381.
- a commentator, 6th cent. 470, n. 482.
- Omar*, Kalif, captured Jerusalem, 7th cent. 517, n (18). 530.
- Ὀμοιόσιος*, of like essence 358, n (47).
- Ὀμοόσιος*, of the same essence 352, n (29).
- Ophites*, sect of, 2d cent. 180, 181, n (25).
- Optatus*, of Milevi, 4th cent. 300. 304, n (36).
- Oresius*, monk of Egypt, 4th cent. 299, n.
- Orientius*, *Orontius*, or *Oresius*, bp of Aux, 5th cent. 408, n (13).
- bp of Eliberis, 6th cent. 478, n.
- Origen*, of Alexand. 3d cent. 189. 198. 204, n (9). 219, n (7). 222. 223. 227. 228. 229. 245. 328. 342.
- Origenists*, 328. 414. 484. 485, n (13).
- Orosius*, Paul, histor. 5th cent. 376. 397, n (33). 442.
- Ostiarii*, their office, 3d cent. 202.
- Ostrogoths*, AD. 492, invade Italy 370.
- Oswald*, k. of Northumberland, 7th cent. 501, n.
- Oswy*, k. of Northumberland, 7th cent. 502, n.
- Pachomius*, Egypt. monk, 4th cent. 299. 389, n (18).
- Pacianus*, bp of Barcelona, 4th cent. 309. 315.
- Paganism*, its character 27 &c. Remains of it, in 4th cent. 269. 274: in 5th cent. 371. 376: in 6th, 450. 454: in 7th, 506.
- Palestine*, provinces of 282, n. 384.
- Palladius*, monk, 4th cent. 296, n (27). 392, n (25).
- missionary to Ireland, 5th cent. 374.
- Pamphylus*, the martyr, 3d cent. 215. 295, n (21).
- Pantaenus*, of Egypt, 2d cent. 120, n (5). 136. 151. 153.
- Papal* power; in 3d cent. 201: in 4th, 284 &c. 338, n (5): in 5th, 386 &c. n (11), (14): in 6th, 462: in 7th, 513 &c.
- Papias*, bp of Hierapolis, 2d cent. 150. 154.
- Paphnutius*, monk of Egypt, 4th cent. 299. 351.
- Paschasius*, of Rome, 6th cent. 478, n.
- Paterius*, commentator, 7th cent. 520, n. 524.
- Patriarchs*, origin of 143. 144. 281 &c. 384.

- Patricius*, (St. Patrick, Succathus,) apostle of Ireland, 5th cent. 374, n (13). 402.
- Patripassians*, sect, in 2d cent. 182: in 2d, 240. 242.
- Patronage*, right of, its origin, 4th cent. 332, n (5).
- Paul*, the apostle 54. His martyrdom 55. 57, n.
- the hermit of Egypt, 3d cent. 218.
- of Samosata, 3d cent. 243, n (15). 244, n (16).
- bp of Emessa, 5th cent. 396.
- a Monophysite, 7th cent. 532.
- Paulicians*, sect, 7th cent. 530.
- Paulinus*, of Nola 304, n (37). 398.
- Petricordius, a poet, 5th cent. 403.
- 1st bp of York, 7th cent. 501, n.
- Peada*, k. of Mercia, 7th cent. 502, n.
- Pelagius*, the heretic, 5th cent. 439 &c. n (45).
- I. bp of Rome, 6th cent. 480. 488.
- II. bp of Rome, 6th cent. 480.
- Pelagians*: in 5th cent. 439 &c: in 6th, 492: in 7th, 530.
- Penance*: in 1st cent. 100: in 2d, 160: in 7th, 526.
- People*, rights of, in prim. church 82: in 2d cent. 142. 143: in 3d, 200: in 4th, 280. 281.
- Perpetua*, a martyr, 3d cent. 191.
- Persecutions*, whether just ten. 62. Those in 1st cent. 61 &c: in 2d, 129 &c: in 3d, 191 &c: in 4th, 252 &c. 339. 340. 341, n (12). 354. 355. 356. 364 &c: in 5th cent. 376 &c. 419 &c. 421: in 6th, 456. 492. 493. 494: in 7th, 506.
- Persia*, persecutions there 275. 377. 506.
- Peter*, the apostle. His martyrdom 55. 57, n.
- bp of Alexandria, 4th cent. 288, n (12). 322.
- Chrysol. bp of Ravenna, 5th cent. 399, n (38).
- Fullo, bp of Antioch, 5th cent. 435 &c.
- Moggus, bp of Alexand. 5th cent. 435. 437.
- a deacon of Rome, 6th cent. 474, n.
- Petilianus*, a Donatist writer, 4th cent. 310.
- Phantasiastae*, sect, 6th cent. 496.
- Pharisees*, Jewish sect 41. 42.
- Philastrius*, bp of Brescia, 4th cent. 306, n (39). 316.
- Philetus*, mentioned by St. Paul 108.
- Philip*, emp. 3d cent. whether a christian 187. 188.
- of Side, 5th cent. 395. 408.
- a friend of Jerome, 5th cent. 402.
- Philo*, of Carpathus, 6th cent. 407.
- Philosophy*, state of, in 1st cent. 33 &c. 71 &c. 77: in 2d, 135 &c: in 3d, 197 &c: in 4th, 269. 277 &c: in 5th, 380 &c: in 6th, 459 &c: in 7th, 512.
- oriental 33. 45. 73 &c.
- its influence on theology 73. 128. 140. 171. 182. 198. 314.
- Philostorgius*, eccl. histor. 5th cent. 395. 409.
- Philostratus*, a philos. 3d cent. 195.
- Philoxenus*, or Xenaias, bp of Hierapolis or Mabug, 6th cent. 435. 482. 497.
- Phocus*, emp. 7th cent. 513.
- Phoebadius*, bp in France, 4th cent. 309.
- Photinus*, bp of Sirmium, 4th cent. 361, n (58).
- Picts*, converted, in 4th cent. 450, n (7).
- Pierius*, of Alexand. 3d cent. 214. 219.
- Pisides*, Gregory or George, 7th cent. 517, n (20).
- Placidus*, Benedict. monk, 6th cent. 468.
- Plato*, and Platonic philosophy 35 &c: in 2d cent. 135 &c: in 3d, 194 &c. 198: in 4th 277 &c: in 5th, 380 &c: in 6th, 459 &c: in 7th, 512.
- Pliny*, the younger 120.
- Pleroma*, of the Gnostics 75.
- Plotinus*, a philosopher, 3d cent. 197. 198. 199. 233.
- Plutarch*, of Chaeronea, a philos. 2d cent. 134.
- a philosopher of 3d cent. 198.
- Nestorii, philos. 5th cent. 381.
- Pneumatomachi*, sect, 4th cent. 363.
- Polemic*: see *Theology*, polemic.
- Polycarp*, bp of Smyrna, 2d cent. 92 132. 166.
- Polychronius*, bp of Apamea, 5th cent. 394. 407.
- Polycrates*, bp of Ephesus, 2d cent. 166. 212.
- Pomerius*, Julianus, 5th cent. 404. 411. 524. 526.
- Pontius*, deac. of Carthage, 3d cent. 213.
- or Paulinus, of Nola 304, n (37). 398.
- Popery*: see *Papal* power.
- Porphyry*, a philos. 3d cent. 194. 198, n (4).
- Possidius*, or Possidonius, 5th cent. 402.
- Pothinus*, missionary to Gaul, 2d cent. 123.
- Potamiena*, a martyr, 3d cent. 191.
- Potamon*, a philosopher, 2d cent. 36.
- Praxeas*, a confessor, and Monarchian, 2d cent. 182, n (26).
- Preaching*, mode of, in 3d cent. 229: in 4th, 333.
- Predestinarian* controversy. 5th cent. 443 &c. n.
- Presbyters* 54. 81. 82. 142. 144. 200. 280. 281. 287. 387.
- Prescription*, against errors, 3d cent. 223, n (12).
- Priesthood*, Jewish, imitated, 2d cent. 144. 162.

- Primasius**, of Adrumetum, 6th cent. 475, n (38).
Priscilla, and Priscillianists, 2d cent. 185, n (30).
Priscilian, and Priscilianists, 4th cent. 364. 365, n (65). 366, n (66).
Proba, Anicia Falconia, 4th cent. 309.
Proclus, bp of Cpl. 5th cent. 396.
 — a philos. 5th cent. 455, n (8). 381.
Procopius, of Gaza, 5th cent. 469, n (21). 482.
 — of Cesarea, histor. 6th cent. 454, n (2).
Prophets, of the N. Test. 83.
Prosper, of Aquitain, 5th cent. 399, n (40). 410. 446, n.
Prudentius, a poet, 4th cent. 307, n (43).
Psalms of David, used in 4th cent. 333.
Ptolomaeus, Gnostic heresiarch, 2d cent. 179.
Purgatory, belief of, in 4th cent. 311 : in 5th, 406 : in 6th, 481 : in 7th, 523.
Pyrrhus, bp of Cpl. 7th cent. 534.
Quadratus, bp of Athens, 2d cent. 130. 150.
Quadragesimal, or lent fast, 4th cent. 334, n (13).
Quadrivium, what 380, n (4).
Quinisextum consilium, 7th cent. 528. 539.
Recognitions of Clement 90. 91, n (29). 224, n (15).
Relics, venerated, in 4th cent. 312, n (1). 313: in 5th, 406: in 6th, 481: in 7th, 523.
Religion, state of, in the world 30 &c. 39. 44: Among christians, in 1st cent. 95, 99, n (8) : in 2d, 152 &c : in 3d, 216 &c : in 4th, 311. 322: in 5th, 405 &c : in 6th, 481 : in 7th, 523.
Remigius, abp of Rheims, 5th cent. 403. 450.
Rheticus, bp of Autun, 4th cent. 308.
Rhodon, a writer, 2d cent. 151.
Rites : see *Ceremonies*.
Rufinus, of Aquileia, 4th cent. 305, n (38). 314. 329.
Ruling Elders, 1st cent. 83.
Ruricius, senior, bp of Limoges, 5th cent. 403.
Rusticus, deac. at Rome, 6th cent. 479.
Sabas, a Syrian monk, 5th cent. 396.
Sabellius, of Africa, 3d cent. 241, n (12).
Sabinus, bp of Heraclia, 5th cent. 395.
Saducees, a Jewish sect 41. 42.
Saints, worshipped, in 5th cent. 406 : in 6th, 463. 481. 490 : in the 7th, 523.
Salonius, bp of Lyons, 5th cent. 403.
Salvianus, 5th cent. 376. 399, n (39). 410. 413.
Samaritans, nation of 39. 46.
Samosateans : see *Paul* of Samosata.
Sapor II. k. of Persia, 4th cent. persecutes 275.
Sarabaites, vagrant monks 321.
Saracens, their conquests, 7th cent. 509.
Sardica, council, its 4th canon 286, n (9).
Saturninus, of Antioch, heretic, 171. 172.
Schisms : see *Heresies*, and *Controversies*.
Scholastic theology, its origin 217. 314. Its nature 483.
Schools, christian : in 1st cent. 98, n (5) : in 2d, 141 : in 3d, 198. 199. 216 : in 4th, 276 : in 5th 379 : in 6th, 457 : in 7th, 511.
Science : see *Learning*.
Scotland, state of, in 3d cent. 190 : in 6th, 451, n (7).
Scriptures, how regarded : in 1st cent. 95 : in 2d, 153 : in 4th, 313.
Sects : see *Heresies*.
Secundians, sect, 2d cent. 179.
Sedulius, a Scotch poet, 5th cent. 402.
Semi-Arians, in 4th cent. 357. 358.
Semi-Pelagians : in 5th cent. 445 &c : in 6th, 492 : in 7th, 530.
Serapion, bp of Thmuis, 4th cent. 299.
Sergius, patriarch of Monophysites 460. 494.
 — bp of Cpl. 7th cent. 518, n. 632.
Sethites, a sect, in 2d cent. 180.
Severianus, bp of Gabala, 5th cent. 394. 410.
Severus, emp. in 2d cent. 62. 119. 132.
 — Alexander, emp. 3d cent. 187. 196.
 — Sulpicius, eccl. histor. 4th cent. 307, n (42).
 — bp of Minorca, 5th cent. 401, n.
 — bp of Antioch, 6th cent. 470, n. 482. 494. 496.
Shiites, a Muhammedan sect 509.
Sibylline Oracles, 2d cent. 159, n (14).
Sidonius, Apollinaris, 5th cent. 400, n (43).
Sigan, monument of, China 499, n (1).
Simeon, bp of Jerusalem, 2d cent. 129.
 — Stylites, senior, 5th cent. 411, n (20). 372.
 — — junior, 6th cent. 471.
Simon, Magus 113. 114.
Simplicius, bp of Rome, 5th cent. 403.
 — a philos. 6th cent. 455, n (7).
Siricius, bp of Rome, 4th cent. 309.
Sisebutus, Gothic k. in Spain, 7th cent. 520, n.
Sixtus II. bp of Rome, 3d cent. 214. 194.
 — III. — 5th cent. 402.
Socrates, eccl. histor. 5th cent. 396.
Sonnites, Muhammedan sect 509.
Sophronius, monk of Palestine, 4th cent. 300.
 — bp of Jerus. 7th cent. 517, n (18). 533.
Sozomen, eccl. histor. 5th cent. 396.
Spurious Gospels, Acts, Epistles 88 &c n (23).
Stations, among Romanists, what 490. n (4).

- Stephen I.* bp of Rome, 3d cent. 213. 227.
Stoic philosophy 35, n (37). 135.
Stylites, or pillar saints, 5th cent. 411. 412.
Sub-Deacons, their office 202.
Sulpicius Severus, eccl. hist. 4th cent. 307, n (42).
Superstition, increase of, in 4th cent. 311 &c: in 5th, 405: in 6th, 481: in 7th, 523.
Sussex, kingdom of, converted, 7th cent. 502, n.
Syagrius, writer, 5th cent. 409.
Symmachus, translator of O. Test. 3d cent. 213.
 — bp of Rome, 6th cent. 404. 463 &c.
Synagogues, Jewish 46.
Synesius, bp in Cyrene, 5th cent. 278, n (8). 394.
Synods: see *Councils*.
Syricius, bp of Barcelona, 7th cent. 521.

Tajo, or *Tago*, bp of Saragossa, 7th cent. 512. 521. 524.
Tatian, and his sect, 2d cent. 131. 150. 174.—His harmony of the Gospels 153. n (2).
Talaia, John, bp of Alexandr. 5th cent. 435.
Tartars, enlightened by Nestorians, 7th cent. 499.
Temples, dedicated to saints, 6th cent. 490.
Tertullian, 2d cent. 149, n (9). 132. 154. 155. 185. 223.
Testament, New, translations of 124. 188. 482. 524.
Thalassius, a monk, 7th cent. 518, n. 525.
Themistius, a philos. 4th cent. 271, n (52).
 — Calonymus, 7th cent. 518, n.
Theodoret, or Theodorit, bp. of Cyprus, 5th cent. 390, n (22). 407. 408. 486, n (14).
Theodoric, k. of Ostrogoths, 5th cent. 370. 464.
Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, 4th cent. 392, n (26). 407. 486, n (14).
 — of Heraclea, 4th cent. 298. 314.
 — monk of Egypt, 4th cent. 299, n.
 — of Cesarea, Capp. 4th cent. 484. 486, n (14).
 — Lector, eccl. hist. 6th cent. 471.
 — of Iconium, 6th cent. 472.
 — of Pharan, 7th cent. 518, n.
 — I. bp of Rome, 7th cent. 521.
 — of Raithu, 7th cent. 518, n (21). 525.
 — of Tarsus, abp of Canterb. 7th cent. 502, n. 512. 521. 525.
Theodosius, the Great, emp. 4th cent. 269. 356.
 — II. emp. 5th cent. 371. 378. 433.
 — bp of Alexand. 6th cent. 496.
Theodotus, of Rome, 2d cent. 182.
 — of Ancyra, 5th cent. 393, n (29).
Theognostus, of Alexand. 3d cent. 214. 222.
Theology, positive, scholastic, and mystic 483.
 — exegetic; in 1st cent. 95: in 2d, 153: in 3d, 218 &c: in 4th, 313 &c: in 5th, 406 &c: in 6th, 481 &c: in 7th, 524.
Theology, didactic; in 1st cent. 95: in 2d, 152. 154: in 3d, 216. 222: in 4th, 314 &c: in 5th, 405. 408: in 6th, 481 &c: in 7th, 523 &c.
Theology, practical; in 1st cent. 95. 97: in 2d, 155: in 3d, 222: in 4th, 316 &c: in 5th, 410. 412: in 6th, 483: in 7th, 525.
Theology, polemic; in 1st cent. 100: in 2d, 154: in 3d, 222 &c: in 4th, 315: in 5th, 408 &c: in 6th, 484 &c: in 7th, 526.
Theonas, bp in 4th cent. 308.
Theopaschites, sect, 5th cent. 436. 488.
Theophanes, of Byzantium, 6th cent. 472 n.
Theophilus, bp of Antioch, 2d cent. 147, n (7). 153.
 — bp of Alex. 4th cent. 391, n (24). 300. 329. 414.
 — bp of the Goths, 4th cent. 273.
Theophrastus, a philos. 5th cent. 381.
Theophylact, Simocatta, 7th cent. 518, n.
Therapeutae, a Jewish sect, 43, n (14).
Theurgy, what 139, n (19).
Thomas, the apostle 57, n.—visited India, and some say, China 500, n (2).
 — of Heraclea, 7th cent. 524.
Thundering legion, 2d cent. 127.
Thurificatores, who 192.
Tiberius, emp. 1st cent. 57.
Tichonius, of Africa, 4th cent. 310. 314.
Timothy, companion of St. Paul 57, n.
 — III. bp. of Alexand. 6th cent. 471.
 — bp of Cpl. 6th cent. 470, n.
 — a writer of the 7th cent. 526.
Tithes, 144, n (3). 162.
Tituli, what 332, n (4).
Titus, companion of St. Paul 57 n.
 — of Bostra, 4th cent. 299.
Toleration, among pagans 28. 63.
Traditors, who 253.
Trajan, emp. 2d cent. 119. 129.
Tribonianus, a jurist, 6th cent. 454, n (1).
Trinity, disputes on, in 2d cent. 182 &c: in 3d, 240 &c: in 4th, 342 &c: in 5th, 436: in 6th, 488. 497 &c.
Triphilus, of Cyprus, 4th cent. 298.
Tritheists, in 6th cent. 497.
Trivium, what 380, n (4).
Tychonius, or Tichonius, 4th cent. 310. 314.
Typus. edict of emp. Constans, 7th cent. 535.

- Valens*, emp. 4th cent. 273. 355.
Valentinus, and his sect, 2d cent. 177—179.
Valerian, emp. 3d cent. 194.
 — bp in 5th cent. 402.
Valerius, Spanish monk, 7th cent. 522.
Vandals, when converted 356, n (40).—
 Persecute, in Africa, 5th cent. 422.
Vararanes, k. of Persia, 5th cent. 377.
Veda, of the Indians 72, n (5).
Victor I. bp of Rome, 2d cent. 151. 166.
 — of Antioch, 5th cent. 394. 407.
 — or Victorinus, a poet, 5th cent. 402.
 — Vitensis, 5th cent. 403.
 — of Tununum, 6th cent. 480.
 — of Capua, 6th cent. 479. 482.
Victorinus, of Petau, 3d cent. 215. 222.
 223.
 — Fabius Marcus, 4th cent. 309.
Victorius, or Victorinus, of Gaul, 5th cent. 403.
Vigilius, of Tapsus, 5th cent. 400, n (44).
 — bp of Rome, 6th cent. 479. 487.
Vincentius, of Lerins, 5th cent. 400, n (42).
Vitalianus, bp of Rome, 7th cent. 521. 535.
Vitellius, a Donatist writer, 4th cent. 308.
Ulphilas, or Ulfilas, bp of the Goths, 4th cent. 189, n (10). 273, n (63). 356. n (39).
Voconius, of Africa, 5th cent. 409.
Volusianus, emp. 3d cent. 193.
Ursicinus, bp of Rome, 4th cent. 284.
Waldensians, perhaps in 7th cent. 515.
Wessex, kingdom of, converted, 7th cent. 501, n.
Whitby, council of, 7th cent. 502, n (5).
Wilfrid, bp of York, 7th cent. 502, n. 514, n (5).
Willibrord, Eng. missionary, 7th cent. 503. 504, n (10).
Worship, public, of christians; in 1st cent. 102 &c: in 2d, 164, n (10): in 3d, 229: in 4th, 331. 332: in 5th, 416: in 6th, 489 &c: in 7th, 529.
Writers, Gr. and oriental; in 1st cent. 87 &c: in 2d, 144 &c: in 3d, 204 &c: in 4th, 287 &c: in 5th, 390 &c: in 6th, 468 &c: in 7th, 516 &c.
Writers, Latin; in 1st cent. none: in 2d, 149 &c: in 3d, 210 &c: in 4th, 299 &c: in 5th, 397 &c: in 6th, 472 &c: in 7th, 519 &c.
Wulfilaicus, eremite of Treves, 5th cent. 412.
Xenaias: see *Philoxenus*.
Zacharias, eccl. histor. 5th cent. 397, n.
 — abp. of Mitylene, 6th cent. 471.
Zachaeus, fictitious author, 5th cent. 403.
Zeno, bp of Verona, 4th cent. 309.
 — emp. 5th cent. His *Henoticon* 436 &c. n (36).
Zosimus, pagan histor. 5th cent. 378, n (8). 443.
 — bp of Rome, 5th cent. 401, n.

Mar: 10, 1909

